THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXIV MARCH, 1937 No. 201

EDITORIAL

The season of Lent is, perhaps rather unexpectedly, an answer to a complaint often made. The complaint has lately been expressed once again in a long letter addressed to the Editor, though not in his editorial capacity and not intended for publication. It is somewhat as follows: The true remedy for the troubles of the world is co-operation, or "Bear ye one another's burdens." The Church has been for centuries in charge of this truth, and yet the truth has not been brought home to the conscience of the world. The alleged reason is that "with the concrete spiritual truths of the foundations there has been mixed too much of the sands of Superstition, Dogma, Creed, so that what would have been firm, an imperishable rock, is full of fissures that daily widen and crumble." The writer continues: "I have working with me an apprentice. He was saying the other day how fine it would be to have plenty of money, and what a glorious time he would have if he were wealthy. He could go to the pictures every night, run an expensive car, and many other ideas by which he would make life one long joy. I remarked to him, half-humorously, that his plans for the enjoyment of wealth appeared to include no one but himself, and that many people were of the opinion that the way to real joy and happiness consists of trying to make the lives of others happier, and also that money in any case could not guarantee happiness. He replied, "Oh yes, I know all about that sort of stuff; that's religion, and I don't believe in religion."

The boy's opinion is not important, except as a symptom. But the writer goes on to say: "Modern scientific thought has caused the younger generation to reject the supernatural basis of religion, and with it they appear automatically to reject the real fundamental spiritual values, Truth, Justice, Unselfish-

ness, Sympathy, Understanding, Beauty, Tolerance, Love, to mention a few. These things should not require to be swathed in the wrappings of complicated theologies and contentious creeds. The actual teachings of Christ were quite simple and straightforward, and I think the endeavour to live them is of greater importance than it is to profess a faith in the doctrinal embellishments of Christianity, which all too often appears to be only a superficial acceptance and observance of customs and habits which make little impression and have little meaning. Christianity should be all-embracing and all-enveloping. It is in this spirit that the sacramental rites and other privileges of organized forms of Christianity should be open to all that come for spiritual ministration. There should be no rules or regulations which exclude anyone to whom these things may be of help, no matter how often they may have transgressed against the religious and social codes. The spirit of Christianity must be greater than the letter of its creeds. There is that spiritual spark in every man and woman which may be fanned into flame if it is not extinguished by the weight of unsympathetic condemnation."

What shall we say to these things ? It will hardly do merely to quote St. Paul's answer (Rom. viii. 31) to his own question, because his πρὸς ταῦτα was not controversial—it indicated a response to the catalogue of divine mercies which he had just enumerated—and also because in this instance there is clearly something of God in the objection. Anyone who says, " Sir, we would see Jesus," is worthy of respect. There is, perhaps, one confession which can be made at once without any lowering of standards. We have hurled the whole system too much at the head of the public in the first five minutes. The bruised reed is apt to be broken and the smoking flax to be quenched long before judgment has attained to victory. Canon 79 prescribes that " all schoolmasters shall teach the larger or shorter Catechism in English or Latin *as the children are able to bear*." We have, so to speak, terrified the newcomer by setting before him the larger Catechism in Latin. There is no reference here to " Latinizing " in the ecclesiastical sense, only to the unwise practice of using difficult, academic language. Remember what Tyrrell said in *Reflections on Catholicism*. " Catholicism refuses to despise the half because it is not the whole, or to confound little with nothing. In the bare-walled conventicles of pure reason, if the soul cannot do her best she can do nothing. In a Catholic temple she can do her second

best or her third. . . . This range and versatility commends Catholicism to us as a product of experience, of God working through Nature; and not a device of human reflection. We should find a more exclusively aristocratic or a more exclusively popular religion hard to reconcile with the universalism of Christ's spirit. . . . And lastly, there is an ethical intolerance both as to moral standards and to moral attainments, which seems again to make no account of the laws of growth, to demand an impossible uniformity of level, and to forget that the ethical, like the æsthetic and the intellectual, education of persons and classes must be graduated. Nature does nothing in jumps" (*Scylla and Charybdis*, 31, 56, 57).

But what of the alleged contrast between the simple spiritual values and the complicated dogmas. Poor old dogma! There is hardly a word in the language more misused. The Sermon on the Mount is thought to be a non-dogmatic utterance. Others say, "I have no use for dogmas; give me a simple truth like 'God is Love.'" Some say, "I believe in Christ, but not in a dogmatic way; I believe in Him as Lord and Saviour." A dogma, of course, is simply the registering of the fact that a number of people have found a value, and Bishop Gore was accustomed to say that "God is Love" was the only dogma of religion that he found it really hard to believe. But what did our friend mean by saying that modern scientific thought has caused the younger generation to "reject the supernatural basis of religion"? Who are the villains of the piece? Mr. Gerald Heard in *The Third Morality* suggests that Newton, Darwin and Freud have between them killed Anthropomorphism, by which he means Christianity. The obituary is premature. The report of the death, as Mark Twain once said of his own, has been greatly exaggerated. But the three names are famous landmarks in the intellectual revolution. Which of them is most guilty? Inasmuch as things take a long time to filter through, it is not Freud yet; it is probably Darwin; it may even be devout Sir Isaac Newton, who all unconscious, all unwilling, and all unrecognized, has caused an honest West Country craftsman to suppose that Christianity has lately been exploded by science. It is odd, because at the exact moment when he supposes that twentieth-century science, or nineteenth-century or possibly seventeenth-century science, has destroyed supernatural religion, Mr. Heard and others are pointing out that the elder physicists are dismayed at the collapse of their splendid temple. "The stately building which

they thought was about to enclose man completely, to shut out all vague vistas and to stand fast for ever, they realize now will never be completed on that static plan. They view the changes as a breakdown. With horror they suspect that from these dislocated fragments of physics men will once again construct the crooked and mean temple which they thought they had made for ever impossible." It is true that Mr. Heard himself does not believe that the old Gothic temple of what he insists on calling the anthropomorphic cosmology will ever be reconstructed, but it is also true that many of the scientific old guard, who, to use the elegant phrase that is just now so common in anti-Christian literature, are building on a time-lag, are terribly anxious lest the Fitzgerald Contraction or Heisenberg's Principle of Indeterminacy should prove to be the thin end of a religious wedge. Let them be reassured. Christianity is interested in these things, but it does not depend on gaps in other people's realms of knowledge, or on dissensions or rebellions elsewhere. It depends on something of its own.

However, this does not help the Editor much with his friend. Heisenberg does not cut any ice at present with the plain man. And by the time that he does, it will be too late. The ice will have melted. He will have been superseded. Popoff will then hold the field with his new theory of gravitational psychology, or Piffelheimer with his famous chart of the twenty-four essential pentagons of consciousness. But this is where Lent comes in. It is at first sight unpromising. It is a very institutional institution, and there is grave peril of mechanical acquiescence. It is in one aspect a matter of rules, and repressions, and limitations, and all the nasty things which psychologists dream of when their physiology is functioning subnormally. And yet what did the Gospel for Quinquagesima say? "Jesus of Nazareth is passing by." Deep breathing may be a good sedative in chronic cases of ambition or possessiveness, and China tea, not over strong, may be a useful stimulant when the brow is depressed by a failure of the League of Nations or the persistent church-going of an otherwise perfectly intelligent brother-in-law, but the Gospel is the salvation of mankind. The idea that Jesus of Nazareth is passing by is so simple that anyone can understand it. Yet the effect of the words "Receive thy sight" may be so profound that eternity does not exhaust it. "May be," not "will be," because truth is like that. It makes you free, but at the same time it leaves you free to bind yourself. "What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?" That is, Personal Religion.

Yet Personal Religion can only be attained and practised in the Church and in the world. Mr. Heard says: "The anthropomorphist did not understand the full compass of man's spirit and that its kinship with outer reality was not through man and that reality being personal, but through each being more than personal." Did Christianity ever teach us to say that God is *a* Person ? Is any Christian ever taught by his religion to think of himself merely as an individual ? My dear sir, whether you are an intellectual or a thoughtful wage-earner, take your place with the emancipated citizens of the Catholic Church and the spacious and, as we understand, constantly expanding but not infinite universe, in some parish church, and carry on with keeping Lent.

Two matters of importance are of necessity held over for another month, save in so far as one of them is treated in the article which we publish by Dr. Nicholas Zernov, a Russian lay theologian. The Edinburgh Faith and Order Conference is one, and the other is the difficult subject which was considered by the Convocations at their winter group of sessions and will come up again in June, the proposal that divorced and remarried persons may in certain circumstances be admitted to Holy Communion. The pressure of pastoral instincts in bishop or priest or layman who is considering a hard case pulls both ways. On the one hand, for the sake of the purity of Christian ethics we ought not to play tricks with the standard. On the other hand, for the sake of the lame dog we ought not to be harder than we must.

THE CORONATION OATH

THE Declarations concerning Religion made by Kings of England at their Accession and their Coronation have undergone various changes in the course of centuries. In the period just before the Reformation the form of the Coronation Oath taken by King Henry VII. included the promise to " ratify and confirm the laws, customs and liberties granted to the clergy and people by his predecessor and glorious King, Saint Edward."

In the period following the Reformation all the Stuart kings took the Coronation Oath in the form that they would " confirm to the people of England, according to the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel established in this kingdom." That is the form in which King James II. repeated it. The terms are unquestionably indefinite, and liable to more than one interpretation. It is quite true that in his Coronation Oath James II. " had promised to protect the Church without openly specifying what he meant by this term."* And his steady, persistent efforts to advance the Papal claims had the effect of uniting the Episcopal Church with the Presbyterians in a common resolute resistance against him.

What educated Englishmen felt about the Coronation Oath as it had been taken by James II. is illustrated in Evelyn's *Diary*. Writing to Archbishop Sancroft in 1688, Evelyn observed that in all King James's declarations there was " not once the least mention of the Reformed or Protestant Religion, but only of the Church of England as by law established, which Church the Papists tell us is the Church of Rome." Thus the language was ambiguous. Evelyn accordingly suggested that if the words Reformed and Protestant were inserted the Papists' interpretation would be defeated.†

When James II. disappeared from the throne and William III. entered into possession, the form of the Coronation Oath was naturally reconsidered. It was resolved by common consent to reconstruct the terms of the Royal Declaration in such a manner as effectively to prevent any such interpretation as that which the former King had practically placed upon it.

" The vague promise made by James II., to observe the laws of St. Edward, now became an oath against absolute government couched in the most precise terms."‡

The Act of Parliament in 1689, determining the new form

* Wickham Legg, in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 694.
† *C.Q.R.*, 1902, p. 13.
‡ *C.Q.R.*, 1902, p. 12.

of the Coronation Oath, was prefaced by an account which made its purpose clear. It said that " by the law and ancient usage of this Realm, the Kings and Queens thereof have taken a solemn Oath upon the Evangelists at their respective Coronations, to maintain the Statutes, Laws and Customs of the said Realm, and all the people and Inhabitants thereof, in their Spiritual and Civil Rights and Properties." It went on to complain that the Oath hitherto administered was " framed in doubtful words and expressions, in relation to ancient laws and constitutions at this time unknown." It concluded that " one uniform oath " was to be taken in future by the kings and queens of this realm; and declared what that form of Oath was henceforth to be.

In accordance with these statutes the form of the Coronation Oath taken by King William III. was as follows: " Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law? And will you preserve unto the Bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain to them, or any of them?" To which the King replied: " All this I promise to do."

" Since 1689 the King has sworn, before his anointing, ' to maintain the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law.' Again, the Act for the further limitation of the Crown in 1701 enacted that whosoever shall hereafter come to the Possession of this Crown, shall join in Communion with the Church of England, as by law established."*

The motive of these changes was to protect the independence of the nation against interference from without. It has been truly said that no part of the Coronation Service reflects more clearly the constitutional conflict of the seventeenth century, and the triumph of the movement against Popery and arbitrary power, than the Royal Declaration.†

The introduction of the term Protestant into the Coronation Oath was an Act of the State, not of the Church. When William III. employed the term in his dealings with Convocation he encountered difficulties. He sent an address to Convocation assuring the clergy that he would offer them nothing but what shall be to the honour, peace and advantage of the Protestant Religion in general, and of the Church of England in particular. To this address the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury replied, expressing their gratitude to the King for his zeal in behalf of the Protestant Religion in general and the Church of England

* Ratcliff, *The English Coronation Service*, p. 25.
† Wickham Legg, in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 694.

in particular, and thanking him for providentially preserving them from Popish tyranny. This reply of the Bishops was not approved by the clergy of the Lower House. They suggested a different version, which, however, the Bishops rejected. They then proceeded to make amendments in the Bishop's reply to the King. This led to a Conference between the two Houses, conducted principally by the Bishop of Salisbury on the one side and the Prolocutor of the Lower House on the other.

Cardwell says that the Bishop of Salisbury " urged that the Church of England was not distinguished from other Protestant Churches but by its hierarchy and revenues, and that it was an equivocal expression: for if Popery should prevail it would be called the Church of England still. To which the Prolocutor answered that the Church of England was distinguished by its doctrine as it stands in the Articles, Liturgy and Homilies, as well as by its hierarchy, and that the term of Protestant Churches was much more equivocal, because Socinians, Anabaptists and Quakers assumed that title."*

The Bishops then drew up an address to the King thanking him for his zeal for the Church of England, " whereby we doubt not the interest of the Protestant Religion in all other Protestant Churches, which is dear to us, will be the better secured." This form of the address was sent down to the Lower House for their concurrence. But the Lower House resolved to return thanks to the King in a form of their own. The form passed by the Lower House omitted the reference to the Protestant Religion. To this new form of address the Bishops objected, and sent down to the Lower House three reasons why the phrase Protestant Religion should be inserted in the reply to the King: " First because it is the known denomination of the common doctrine of the Western part of Christendom, in opposition to the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome. Secondly, because the leaving this out may have ill consequences, and be liable to strange constructions both at home and abroad among Protestants as well as Papists. Thirdly, because it agrees with the general reason offered by the clergy for their amendments, since this is expressly mentioned in the King's message, and in this the Church of England being so much concerned, the Bishops think it ought still to stand in the address." The Lower House continued unconvinced by the arguments of the Bishops. They declined to admit the words Protestant Religion. The Bishops, however, refused to leave the words out. But they offered to the Lower House an amended form which ran as follows: " After the words

* *Conferences*, p. 445.

Establishment of the Church of England add, whereby we doubt not the interest of the Protestant Religion in this and all other Protestant Churches, which is dear to us, will be the better secured." Once more the Lower House objected, and demanded that the words "this and" (that is to say the words identifying the Church of England with the Protestant Religion) should be cancelled. To this alteration the Bishops consented. The final form of the Convocation Address to the King accordingly was: "Whereby we doubt not the interest of the Protestant Religion in all other Protestant Churches which is dear to us will be better secured." It was a compromise. But it prevented the Convocation from identifying the Church of England with the Protestant Religion.

The silencing of Convocation by the State in 1717, and its practical suppression, so far as enacting anything is concerned, until 1851, that is to say for a period of 135 years, deprived the Church of its constitutional organ of synodical self-expression. Ecclesiastical legislation became transferred to Parliament, and passed independently of any official consent on the part of the Church. The Coronation Oath, inserted in the Service by the State, was repeated at the beginning of each new reign in phrases to which the Church had never constitutionally consented.

The Church of England has never called itself Protestant, either in the Prayer Book, or in the Articles, or in the Homilies, or in any of the Canons of the English Church, nor in any other authoritative document. This exclusion from every official document representing the principles of the English Church cannot be accidental.

In the Form of Coronation Oath taken by Edward VII. the Archbishop asked: "Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law? And will you maintain and preserve inviolably the settlement of the Church of England and the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government thereof as by law established in England? And will you preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of England, and to the Church therein committed to their charge, all such Rights and Privileges, as by law do or shall appertain to them, or any of them?" And the King replied: "All this I promise to do."

The use of the term Protestant in the Coronation Oath came into considerable discussion during the debates in Parliament in 1901* and in 1910 on the Declaration made against Transubstantiation by the Monarch at his Accession. This

* *Hansard*, July 5, 1901.

Declaration, which was drawn up in the time of Charles II., asserted that there is not any Transubstantiation of the Elements in the Holy Communion; that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass as they are now used in the Church of Rome are superstitious and idolatrous. This Declaration was originally imposed on all Members of Parliament. On the accession of William III. it was extended to include the Crown. It was repeated by all subsequent occupants of the English Throne down to and including King Edward VII.

In 1829 the Declaration ceased to be required of Members of Parliament. In the first year of the twentieth century an effort was made to modify the terms which the King was still expected to repeat. Lord Salisbury introduced on the subject a Bill in 1901, which has been characterized as having offended the Protestants without satisfying the Roman Catholics. It failed to secure consent.

The general tone of the Debate in the House of Lords on the proposed revised form of the Royal Declaration may be illustrated by the variety of statements made.* It was remarked that it conspicuously omitted the supremacy of the Pope; that the personal position of the Sovereign in 1901 was extremely different from that which it was in the seventeenth century, when this Declaration was first imposed; that the Declaration denouncing certain doctrines as " damnable " formerly imposed on every member of the House of Commons in the nineteenth century had been repealed, and the Protestant Faith was none the worse; that the suggested revision was not to the credit of the House of Lords, and should be reconsidered; that the purpose of the Declaration was very obvious, namely, to provide a disclaimer on the part of the Monarch that he belongs to the Roman Catholic Church; that it is not a dogmatic expression of theological belief, but a disclaimer of membership of the Church of Rome; that the rejection of Transubstantiation had been introduced because a declaration against Papal supremacy was not sufficient. It was also remarked that the whole discussion exhibited a very great amount of agreement on one point, namely, that the House of Lords was not a fitting place for theological discussion; and that this being the case, it ought not to be asked to confirm or deny the truth of theological propositions; that if the matter is one of political necessity, let the Declaration be political and not theological; that the Declaration, instead of denouncing doctrines, should consist simply in affirming that the King belongs to the Church of England, and not to the Church of Rome, or that he denies

* *Hansard*, August 1, 1901.

the right of the Pope to interfere in temporal matters. Profound distrust was expressed as to the value of any theological tests; and there was an evident desire to relieve the Declaration of such phrases as may be deemed offensive. A warning was issued on the Roman side that a Revision hastily constructed, and with which no party appeared to be satisfied, could never be considered to have laid the matter in dispute finally to rest. It was further said on the Roman Catholic side that Transubstantiation is a word which requires a deep knowledge of theology to understand, and ought not to be placed on the level of popular controversy; and that it seemed to escape the attention of those who promoted this revised form that any Roman Catholic could subscribe to the Declaration with a clear conscience. In the end the Bill was passed by the Lords and sent to the Commons, and came to nothing.

On the Accession of King George V. in 1910, it was felt that the time had come when the Declaration could be safely revised. Asquith introduced a Bill into Parliament proposing that the King should affirm himself to be " a faithful member of the Protestant Reformed Church as by law established in England." This was introduced in June. The Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords took exception to these words, " because they would have given by statutory enactment a perfectly new designation to the Church of England, and would have given it in a formal way without any adequate reason." The Primate distinguished : " There is a perfectly true sense in which the word Protestant is rightly applied to the Church of England, and has been applied to it for many centuries. There is no doubt that the Church of England is in the historical sense of the word Reformed, but the words Protestant Reformed as a title are neither distinctive nor exclusive, and certainly they are not co-extensive with the true character of that portion of the Church Catholic which has claimed and held the allegiance of the great mass of the English people."

On further reflection, Asquith altered his proposed revision of the Declaration, and when the matter was debated in July, he produced a different form, in which the King declared himself simply to be a faithful Protestant, and the objectionable words about the Protestant and Reformed Church as by law established in England disappeared.

Asquith argued that the Protestant succession was amply secured by the express terms of the Bill of Rights, and that the Declaration on Accession was superfluous. Its abolition would be the logical and natural course. But he contented himself with the gentler proposal to modify its contents by

removing clauses which caused great offence to a very large number of the King's subjects. He drew attention to the fact that the word Protestant is not to be found in the Book of Common Prayer, and is not to be found in the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, and is not to be found in any of the Canons of that Church, although it is to be found in the Coronation Oath, and in various Acts of Parliament. He did his best to defend the word, and contended that the sensitiveness about its use shewn in some quarters in the twentieth century was of entirely modern growth, and in his own opinion attributable to the Tractarians. He professed himself unable to understand why resentment to the term Protestant should exist, but omitted to consider whether the reason might not be that the word itself had in the course of time very greatly changed its meaning.

The Bill passed through both Lords and Commons without any difficulty, and received the Royal Assent in the following month.

The Statutory Declaration of His Majesty's Protestant Faith was made by King George V. in the following terms:

"I do solemnly and sincerely in the presence of God profess, testify and declare that I am a faithful Protestant, and that I will, according to the true intent of the enactments which secure the Protestant succession to the Throne of my Realm, uphold and maintain the said enactments to the best of my power according to law."

If the significance of the King's profession that he is himself a faithful Protestant, and also of his Oath at his Coronation that he will maintain the Protestant Reformed Religion, are to be rightly understood, it is necessary to bear in mind the historical meanings of the term Protestant.

As the Oxford Dictionary reminds us, a Protestant originally denoted a German Prince or State who dissented from the judgment pronounced by the Diet of Spires in 1529 against the Reformation. In the sixteenth century the name Protestant was generally adopted in Germany by the Lutherans, while the Swiss and the French called themselves Reformed.

Gradually the name came to represent those who repudiated Papal authority. Here in England in Queen Elizabeth's reign the usual contrast in religion was drawn between Protestant on the one side and Papist on the other.

In the seventeenth century members of the Church of England were accustomed to call themselves Protestants, plainly in this sense. For they did so "to the exclusion of Presbyterians, Quakers and Separatists." Clearly, therefore, Protestant was the opposite of Papist.

In process of time the term Protestant acquired a second meaning. It came to include those who abandoned the historic Creeds, the Sacramental System, and the Historic Ministry. In this second meaning Protestant is no longer the opposite of Papal: it is rather the opposite of that which is historically known as Catholic.

When King William III., as a Dutch Calvinist, assured the English people of his intention to maintain the Protestant religion in general and the Church of England in particular, the sense in which he employed the term is clear: for he attempted to eliminate principles and practices of a Catholic nature from the Anglican liturgy, an attempt which Convocation frustrated.

The distinction between these two meanings of the term Protestant becomes as clear as light if we ask: Are the Orthodox Churches of the East Protestant or not? There is not a Church in the world more completely opposed to the Papal supremacy than the Eastern Churches are. They reject it with an emphasis nowhere surpassed. If, then, Protestant means rejection of the Papal claims, the Eastern Churches are the most Protestant in the world. And yet there is not a Church in the world more completely identified with those conceptions of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Real Presence, the priestly consecration, the Apostolic Succession, than the Orthodox Churches of the East. And all this is what Protestantism emphatically rejects. If, then, Protestant means rejection of what is Catholic, the Eastern Churches are as far from Protestant as any part of the Church on earth. This shews how essential it is to explain which meaning you intend. The question therefore is: In what sense is the Church of England Protestant?

It has been the continual complaint of Protestant Communions that the Protestantism of the Church of England is of a very peculiar kind. Thus, for instance, among French Protestants that very acute and penetrating critic Scherer declares that the subject of ministerial authority not only divides the Roman Church from the Churches of the Reformation, but also divides these latter from each other, since the Eglise Anglicane in this matter is separated from the Reformed Communions. In Scherer's opinion the Church of England stands alone among the Churches of the Reformation.*

Charles Beard, himself a Protestant minister, deals admirably with this question—What constitutes a Protestant?—in his *Hibbert Lectures* on the Reformation, lately re-edited by Professor Ernest Barker. Beard insists that "the English Reformation, both in its method and result, is a thing by itself,

* *Requisse d'une theorie de L'Église Choretrienne*, pp. 124, 157.

taking its place in no historical succession, and altogether refusing to be classified." "After the lapse of three centuries and a half it is still possible to discuss whether the English Church is Protestant or Catholic." "The Reformation in England followed no precedents, and was obedient only to its own law of development." Beard lays stress on the "fact which more than any other differentiates the English Church," namely, its Continuity. "There is no point at which it can be said, here the old Church ends, here the new begins." After a careful analysis of the process of the Anglican Reformation, Beard concludes that two distinct elements have been present in the English Church, these elements being respectively Protestant and Catholic. It is the peculiarity of the Church of England that it is both. As a test of the distinction between Protestant and Catholic, the Hibbert Lecturer had already declared that "Whatever Church says and means priest, is on the Catholic side of the great controversy of Christianity; whatever Church says and means minister, in that act proclaims itself Protestant": the Catholic principle being "the nourishing of the religious life by sacraments which can be duly administered only by a sacerdotal order." Applying this test to the Church of England, it is Catholic. It "has priests who, in virtue of episcopal ordination, exercise the mysterious power of forgiving sins, and sacraments which only duly ordained priests can administer."

Yet the Lecturer finds that the Thirty-Nine Articles are in closest relation to a Protestant Confession. "All this constitutes an historical phenomenon quite different from that presented by any of the Reformed Churches of the Continent." "Only within narrow limits can we apply descriptive epithets to the Church of England, which will not be angrily repudiated by one of her two opposed yet equally characteristic parties."

The Unitarian Martineau, writing of the Church of England, recognized its distinctive character by observing that "its hierarchy ascends by the same gradations, and retains the same titles, as the parent body: its creeds are translations of ancient forms: its liturgy is a provincial idiom of the language of the universal Church. The Anglicans are right in maintaining that it was not of Protestant origin, but rather a national graft detached from the stem of so many centuries."*

When Edmund Burke contended that the admission of Roman Catholics to the franchise was not inconsistent with the King's Coronation Oath he insisted that "it is not a fundamental part of the settlement at the Revolution that the State should be Protestant *without any qualification* of the term.

* *Essays*, 1891, vol. ii., p. 116.

With a qualification it is true; not in all its latitude. With the qualification it was true before the Revolution."* "There never has been a religion of the State (the few years of the Parliament only excepted) but that of the Episcopal Church of England: the Episcopal Church of England before the Reformation, connected with the See of Rome; since then, disconnected, and protesting against some of her doctrines, and against the whole of her authority, as binding on our national Church." The Church of Scotland knows as little of Protestantism undefined as the Church of England does. "At no time was the Protestant religion, undefined, established here or anywhere else, as I believe."

Burke urged that "the King is bound by law, as clearly specified in several Acts of Parliament, to be in communion with the Church of England." It is part of the tenure by which he holds his crown. "The King may *inherit* the Crown as a Protestant; but he cannot *hold* it, according to law, without being a Protestant *of the Church of England*." "It was not settled at the Revolution that the State should be Protestant, in the latitude of the term, but in a defined and limited sense only, and that in that sense only the King is sworn to maintain it." Burke added that "if mere dissent from the Church of Rome be a merit, he that dissents the most perfectly is the most meritorious. In many points we hold strongly with that Church. He that dissents throughout with that Church will dissent with the Church of England, and then it will be a part of his merit that he dissents with ourselves: a whimsical species of merit for any set of men to establish."†

It is therefore perfectly clear that if the term Protestant is applied to the Church of England, it can only be in the sense of anti-Papal, for it cannot be in that of Anti-Catholic. And where the King in the Royal Declaration affirms himself to be a faithful Protestant it can only be as opposed to the Papal claim, and not as opposed to the Faith of a Catholic. The Protestant of the Coronation Oath is a Protestant of the Church of England. He is a Protestant who during his Coronation is presented with the ring of royal dignity as an emblem of the Catholic Faith.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

* *Works*, vol. iv., p. 257.

† *Ibid.*, A.D. 1792, p. 263.

BIOGRAPHY WITH AND WITHOUT GOD

I

It is strange and startling to read modern biography, and to find life after life lived without definite recognition of religion as an essential. Some of these men and women of achievement have shewn real Christian qualities in doing their duty towards their neighbour with burning zeal. Their very virtues puzzle us, for to those secure in " sure hope " of the hereafter, it remains an insoluble problem how they can labour on without it.

A few of them did, in common phrase, enjoy life up to a certain point. The majority, however, suffer from a dreary discontent born of their bitter conviction that all is vanity. This has its origin in frequent fear of death, and shrinking from pain. Old age to such is very terrible in its inevitability, to them there is unreal irony in that triumphant line of Bishop Walsham How, " The golden evening *brightens* in the west." To the happy " warriors " of the Church Militant, record after record proves its truth.

The valiant call of St. Teresa echoes down the centuries like inspiring music: " Unless we resolve ourselves once for all to resign ourselves to death and ill-health, we shall never do anything. Endeavour to lose all fear of them and leave everything in God's hands come what may. How many times have our bodies mocked us, let us mock them for once." Gallant St. Catherine of Siena, " ever a fighter," proclaims: " Perseverance is the queen that is crowned; she stands between fortitude and patience." For the true disciple, past and present are thus but prologues to a future of " radiancy divine."

To those in rudderless boats on a stormy sea, the future is an empty void. If they insist they are happy without the " personal God " they deny, this happiness is a toy of circumstance. It is utterly unlike the serenely joyous outlook of pilgrims expectant of the journey's end where their eyes shall behold " the King in His beauty."

Of the former, Arnold Bennett is a typical example. Materialist to the core, his diaries reveal a selfishness pleasantly masked among his fellows by an easy good nature. He liked to give and was generous, and from the first his brilliant success brought abundance of the money he so loved to spend. Even the touching effort of his wife to make a hero of " My Arnold Bennett " is a failure, because he has himself shewn plainly what he was. If we like him for writing daily to his

mother, we are repelled by his minute description of her death, detached as if it were a page torn from *An Old Wives' Tale.* "Bad reading and stumbling of parson." He waves it all aside to hurry back to the costly dinners, the glitter of the theatre of which he never wearied. Callous is his description of the railway accident when he escaped unhurt, not to thank God but to write: "Men began lifting helpless passengers . . . I had no desire to help. I argued incompassionately that it was the incompetent railway's affair. I held my bag and stick and looked around. I did not want to help the wounded." He could quote as a "good story" the profane remarks of Frank Harris: "God when He was young had a liking for the Jews, and when He was old a senile liking for the English." Death came to him in the mediæval guise of the skeleton at the feast. There was no time granted for the prayer of the Litany: From sudden—that is, unprepared—death, good Lord, deliver us.

If Arnold Bennett indeed found compensation in a sequence of tawdry pleasures, it was denied to a far greater writer who knew not God. To read that twenty-five thousand pounds was given for the manuscript of one of his novels is in bizarre contrast with the chronic unhappiness of Josef Conrad, the Pole who wrote in English better than most of his English contemporaries. He too had a wife who gave him a wellnigh incomprehensible devotion. Mrs. Conrad in her pathetic desire to keep his laurels evergreen has caused them to wither. Every page of her biography reveals that selfishness, discontent, and bitter disillusionment kept dark company with her husband. A few lines of quotations suffice: "He called his study his torture chamber"; "characteristically Josef Conrad saw the gloomy side of things first, and continued to do so"; "he continued restless and unsatisfied." She herself set an example of courage he never followed. Of her own serious operation she could say: "Three hours was a lifetime of horror to a super-sensitive man. I was really much more sorry for him than for myself. Anxiety, after all, is the worst kind of pain." She accepts his egotism without a murmur in her painful convalescence: "The two or three visits short and hardly cheerful. . . . He was worn out by the short drive and his emotions. He was disgusted that I was not making quicker progress." He liked to regard his son as "a little pagan," and "chuckled"—horrible word—when the child exclaimed, on hearing first of the Crucifixion: "It's disgusting, it ought to be forgotten." Conrad's attitude towards Christianity was definitely hostile, and he was a miserable man who died unexpectedly and alone. "It was not my fault I failed him," said the faithful wife, still in a nursing home. Her finale is

most pitiful: "As I lay awake, I fancied I heard the familiar 'Damn.'"

To turn to Galsworthy is to find a far nobler nature, and a most attractive character lit many noble attributes. To read his life is to feel that like Thomas Hardy he was not far from the Kingdom of God. He, too, left one poem with something of the wistful evidence of Hardy's "Christmas Eve" that he "sighed for what was not."

> "*If* on a spring night I was by
> And God was standing there,
> What is the prayer that I would cry
> To Him? This is the prayer:
> O Lord of courage grave,
> O Master of the night of spring,
> Make firm in me a heart too brave
> To ask Thee anything."

"*If*." That was the slender bridge he could not cross. He wrote a long letter to Hardy explanatory of his strange involved creed, beyond the grasp of ordinary minds. "Our ignorance, whether we are at the flood or the ebb, together with that perennial love of existence which is implicit in all existing creatures is all one needs to go on." How much clearer is the silver voice "Come unto Me." "Partings," continues Galsworthy, "for the living are a real terror and sorrow, and one can only pity and hope for the best. To dwell on death and what comes after is childish. . . . I am trying to put off that horrid dread of the future."

It is heart-rending to contrast Galsworthy groping for the light that failed with the splendid certainty of Browning: "O thou soul of my soul, I shall clasp thee again, and with God be the rest." Talent hailed as a genius in his lifetime, constant success in the art bringing him a great fortune, the Nobel prize when he lay dying—earthly honours abounded for John Galsworthy. Yet his nephew writes: "I am afraid he is getting apathetic and uninterested." Then came disease in the dreaded form of facial disfigurement, and his courage failed. For him there was no "light at eventide," he had even his room darkened, and finally came the awful silence of paralysis. "He looks, looks *afraid*. He knows as much as we and can't say a word, staring into—what?" That picture was drawn by one who loved a lovable man. Confronted with it we tremble and dare scarcely ask, "O death, where is thy sting!"

The life of the sceptic scientist Edward Clodd has little interest save for striking searchlights upon Hardy. His biographer is out to prove scepticism the short-cut to the happiness he claims for Clodd, when at the age of forty he "flung aside Christianity." He was "a glutton for life, death

he neither feared nor pretended to welcome." Yet Anthony Hope, a discerning intimate, says: " Not happy, I fear." When Clodd heard that Hardy in his latter days went to Church on Sunday mornings he was " staggered." He wrote to Hardy, received no reply, and then dismissed him with a sneer: " A great writer, not a great character." He says contemptuously of Kipling: " He believes in a personal God, a sort of Almighty drill-serjeant "; and is dismayed to hear from Mrs. Andrew Lang that her husband " knelt down by his bed to say his prayers night and morning." Even his eulogistic biographer has to own him at the end " to some extent a querulous Victorian."

And what of the women who make " self-expression " the God of their idolatry ? Brilliant figures who but yesterday left the stage where they shone. Such was Gertrude Lothian Bell, who played her wonderful part in the politics of the East with dazzling success. Did she really ignore religion in what she regarded as the crowded hour of a glorious life ? Or were there hidden depths she would not let us fathom beneath " Mayfair manner and a Paris frock " ? With the brain of an able man she rose to a proud place of power. Yet surely she had her hours of misgiving when she could write of Christmas holidays as " damnable."

A sadder instance is the gifted, wretched Katharine Mansfield. " No, never a personal God," she protests, and the next moment is asking: " What is this mysterious something that waits and beckons ? . . . We resist, we are terribly frightened. The little boat enters the dark fearful gulf, and our only cry is to escape. But it is useless; nobody listens." She was all restless uncertainty: " I thank Heaven that though I am damnable I am in love with nobody but myself." If at one time there was actually a Crucifix hanging over her bed she never seems to have had any sense of sin. It gives a painful shock to find mortal sin touched on in her life as if it were a thing of beauty. Writing her astonishing brief stories, hungry for fame, she ran a race with the consumption that was to cause her early death. Her diary is a poignant human document: " Spent another frightful day. The misery persists and I am almost crushed. Have never known a more hideous day. I wish I could pray to God like Father Tolstoi. . . . My anxious heart is eating up my body, eating up my nerves, eating up my brain. I feel the poison slowly filling my veins, every particle is tainted. I am never, never calm. . . . Why am I troubled every day of my life by the nearness of death and its inevitability ? . . . How I have adored life and dreaded death !" Sometimes in those diaries there came

jarring profanities: "God letting a fly drown in the milk-jug, and the smallest Cherubim and Seraphim of all who *delight in misfortune* struck their harps and shrilled."

She left her birthplace in New Zealand for her fetish of self-expression, and was rewarded by perpetual home-sickness. "About helping others, about carrying a light it seems false to say a word," is her forlorn cry. Yet by a bitter paradox she may help others to turn from the way of selfishness. Even her admiring biographer can only claim for her the "tiny achievement" for which she was ready to exchange her very soul.

II

It is indeed refreshing to turn from despair to the "joy that no man taketh from us." Bishop King in his letters makes them aglow with inspiring certainty: "The old high, quiet, supernatural way is the most powerful because it is independent of the world's affairs. If people make up their minds to go straight to the next world, they might throw up their hats and be happy. . . . A simple, affectionate, unworldly life is all we want." "My happiest time is when I am confirming in country places." "Love is the golden thread God wants us to use. It will draw us to Himself and one another. . . . I need hardly say I have never had a harsh thought of Nonconformists. . . . I like the phrase 'the *gate* of death,' and we think if it as the garden that will open into Paradise." In old age he could still put forth his radiant counsel of perfection: "What I hope rather to do now, D.V., is to spend what time remains in trying to understand what it is to be a Christian. I think it ought to be a remedy for a great many of our bothers, and make us more restful and hopefully happy with a simple sense of freedom and with a real beauty and courage." "I still go on in my simple way loving birds, flowers, and the sunlight on the apples." The harvest indeed of a quiet eye. It means much to have knelt in Lincoln Cathedral, to have seen "as it were the face of an angel," and heard that voice of silver utter the Benediction. Well did Liddon say of him that he "ranked with those who in point of moral beauty stand highest in the English Church with Andrews and Bishop Ken.

We are apt to think now of Liddon as a war-worn knight-errant in the dusty lists of controversy, or as the Chrysostom of whom even a humble provincial newspaper reporter could write: "He struck his hearers with entire forgetfulness of self." Yet there never was a man who clung with more splendid tenacity to the English Church. He stood firm even when

Cardinal Talbot surely cruelly said: "You have heard of the young man with great possessions. You are that man." A schoolfellow described him at seventeen as "sweet, grave, thoughtful, and *complete*," and the father of the writer, badly injured in a football match by a kick from Liddon, never forgot "the pity in those beautiful eyes" as they bent over him. This is a proof his biographer is incorrect when he says that Liddon took no part in games at the then famous school of Dr. Hodges at Lyme Regis. And he, too, fully knew the joy of faith founded on a rock. According to a friend with whom he stayed in Wales, "He loved the sea in all its aspects. The real delight and joy he felt was, I think, the realizations of the might of the Creator. His special delight was to say his offices among the rocks. As he stood bareheaded in their depths, the caves would re-echo with the gloria as he shouted them out, and he would chant psalm after psalm of praise as if nothing could satisfy the exuberance of a thankful heart." None who ever heard Father Stanton preach could forget him, and Father Russell said after his death: "That voice was to them like a very lovely song, teaching them as no other had ever taught them the meaning, the beauty, the consoling and renewing power of the Gospel." More than half a century ago the writer heard it at St. Clement's, Cambridge, a Catholic pioneer church under Canon Edmund Wood. It was thronged that night by undergraduates prepared, it was known, to make a protest against its "ritualism." There had been a fearful colliery disaster, and he began: "I am here to ask help for the widows and orphans of these of the greater love who have just laid down their lives for their friends. I appeal to those who care nothing to leave this holy place quietly." There was a stillness that could be felt; not one moved. In his very last sermon he said: "You say to me, I should like to love and serve my Master better, and I say, Do some good work for Him and I will tell you what will happen. You will feel the glow of love suffusing your whole being, and you may look up to Heaven and see a smile on His face." One Easter he urged: "Well, then, supposing He is the gardener, it is your duty to be happy. Let the love of God be in your heart, the joy of the Lord in your soul, the peace of God in your mind." And surely his own experience dictated what followed: "There are some people who love prayer. It is a joy to them. Their hearts are aflame. . . . Well, then, if God is our glory, what ought we to do? To bask just as we like to bask in the sun. So let us bask in the glory of God." Father Stanton "made death his friend," as he besought others to do: "The sweet English churchyards, the like of which there are none in the

whole continent." Beauty, death. Death, beauty. Never did he know even the shadow of doubt. "If you ask, Shall I meet those I love again? I answer, Yes, I know you will. Love always ends in reunion."

A brief note of admiration for Father William Doyle, S.J., is inevitable. It is needless to dwell on his stern self-inflicted penances, for they went side by side with peace passing understanding. The day he knew his vocation was to be a Jesuit he wrote in his journal: "I played all my joy and happiness into the piano after thus openly giving myself to Jesus." Of his war service one not of his Communion attests: "His was a Christ-like democracy who was recommended for the Victoria Cross for carrying wounded and dying out of action again and again." And after one battle came the news: "On the evening of that heroic day Father Doyle died a martyr to charity. The great dream had come true. He shed his blood whilst working for Christ." Very simply he himself records: "It is a curious thing I have never had an instant's hesitation or fear in going into the greatest danger when duty called." His Irishmen canonized him when he was still with them, and spoke of him with tears when gone. His final message to them "stirs the heart like a trumpet": "Tighten knapsacks on back, pull ourselves together, and step out more hardily for the last mile . . . so that we may say, 'I have done my duty, I have fought a good fight for my country and for God's crown of glory.' They call me a fool, but I just laugh and go my way," as St. Francis might have laughed faring to the same journey's end.

To turn from earthly to heavenly battlefields is to be confronted with the noble figure of Lord Halifax, who flung away place and power to head what is now "The Church Union," with the glad confidence never failing him in the darkest hour. Canon Knox-Little once found Browning gazing fascinated upon his portrait. "That is the face of a St. Francis Xavier," was his comment. "No one can doubt the burning zeal in those eyes." King Edward VII., his close friend, said once: "If ever I become a religious man it shall be Charlie Wood's religion."

His ideal biographer, to whom we cannot be grateful enough, reverently gives the key to his serenity: "There was another Lord Halifax of whom it is almost impossible to write. This was neither the ecclesiastical statesman who had more statecraft than most ministers, and more theology than most Bishops. Nor yet the perfect host at Hickleton. It was the man who knelt day after day at the altar on the threshold of another world, more real to him than the world seen by mortal eye."

Lord Halifax witnessed openly to the faith in the Real Presence which can turn the prose of life into celestial poetry. It was in one of his last speeches at the Albert Hall, where the ovation he received seemed for a moment to unnerve him. Then he said firmly: "I came to see it was the Mass only that signifies, and the Blessed Sacrament became more and more the centre of my spiritual life." To quote his biographer again: "It has been said, in ignorant perversion of history, that the Church of England cannot produce saints. The term is often used loosely or in hyperbole, but from the qualities we attach to it flowed the strength, influence, and charm of Lord Halifax." The sharply contrasted circumstances of saints is arresting. Of this few more striking proofs have been given than the too brief record of one who in her life played many parts. It tells the story of Isabel Bateman which began with brilliant success as an actress—"the sweetest Ophelia of our time"—who did actually "get her to a nunnery," and died a beloved Mother Superior. The Bishop of St. Alban's reaches the conclusion of the whole matter in his preface: "For her the cross stood not for hurting but for healing, not for death but life, not for defeat but victory." There is a pretty picture of the child Isabel and her sister wandering away from their American home to seek martyrdom like a pair of tiny Saint Teresas. Before they sailed for England we hear their vicar was "wise enough to appreciate their spiritual devotions and had them confirmed at nine and eleven."

Early fame in its more glittering form caused no shadow of turning from the narrow way. The writer sees Isabel Bateman in the remote past as a vision of beauty and pathos as Queen Henrietta Maria. And like Christina Rossetti she surrendered earthly love rather than be "yoked with an unbeliever." The idol of London, she was secretly conscious of a compelling vocation. Only the task of helping her family prolonged her triumphs on the stage. Directly duty set her free she gave herself to God. It was no uncostly gift. "Three times she felt it almost impossible to persevere," but soon there came rich reward for her courage. "Beyond the cross she willingly shouldered, was the glory of joy. If few could agonize as she did, few had that spring of eternal joy and youth in such abundance." "She was so human in her talk, quiet touches of humour, appreciation of beauty of every kind." Another speaks of "her cheerfulness and ready wit." She was the first to bring colour into the Rescue "Homes" a drab Puritanism had rendered dreary. "She was a great foundress, her business aptitude very remarkable." "All natural beauties were elements in the great Benedicite of her soul." "As she

drew nearer and nearer to death, her face wore a strange mysterious beauty which lasted to the end." "She was able to receive her Viaticum, and in June, 1834, the lovely spirit was set free." Let the final word be her own: "You know I want God's will above all things. Embrace it with perfect trust and all the pain and sting is gone."

France also has her joyful woman saints of yesterday. The writings of Elizabeth Leseur, translated into almost every European language, are familiar among us. Of her Tennyson might have written:

> "She walked
> Wearing the light yoke of the word of love
> Who stilled the rolling wave of Galilee."

She has left us an exquisite example, and a precious series of guide-books. A confirmed invalid, with the deeper suffering of seeing no sign of the conversion of the agnostic husband she loved tenderly which was to follow her death. She was forced to be in the world though never of it. *Père Janvier* has attested: "God made of her an elect spirit spreading the divine light abundantly around her and making her love it."

Her own prayer was indeed answered: "Let me give to others serenity, charm, kindness, useful words and deeds *to make Christianity beloved.* Render my home attractive, make me a centre of good and wholesome influences . . . ask God to make me a great soul, to love Him with ardour, to serve Him with joy, and make His presence irradiate all about me." Her thoughts are like pearls on a rosary:

> "To think is fine,
> To pray is better,
> To love is all."

"Let us throw as we go on, words, ideas, wishes, without troubling as to who picks them up. There are so many beggars for ideals."

"Who searcheth for truth finds God." What a text for our distracted times! Listen to her gentle advice for Lent: "Follow strictly the counsel of the Master. Never look sad. Never to bear the fast from human satisfaction as a burden. *Let interior joy be the fruit of renunciation and penitence.* Hide my greatest austerities under a more smiling gracious demeanour. Grant me that infinite joy You sometimes accord. That glorious light which illuminates and transforms all. . . . Let me be good with real goodness that comes not from the lips but from the heart. . . . Reserve for God only the depths of my heart."

All who met Elizabeth Leseur fell under her spell. None

knew the spiritual battles she fought; they only saw her triumph. The achievements of the Marie Bashkirtseffs and Katharine Mansfields look pale and poor beside such victory over pain.

By a beautiful coincidence, the psalm for the morning when these last words were written contained the radiant verse "He brought forth His people with joy, and His chosen with gladness."

It is the conclusion of the whole matter. "How bright these glorious spirits shine." We can only feel compassion for those others afraid where no fear is, who too often meet Giant Despair in their vain quest for peace in Doubting Castle.

ROWLAND GREY.

THE EUCHARIST AND THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

DURING this coming summer representatives of various Christian denominations will gather together in Oxford and in Edinburgh to discuss the question of Christian Unity, one of the most urgent problems of our time. There is in this country, as well as in other parts of the world today, a growing conviction that the restoration of Church Unity is the only adequate response which Christianity can make to the challenge of the totalitarian state; yet even the most enthusiastic supporters of the "Life and Work" and of the "Faith and Order" Movements do not expect to see Unity achieved either in Oxford or in Edinburgh.

The attitude of the average Christian towards reunion is one of profound pessimism. Although everyone seems prepared to admit the supreme importance of this task, very few believe in the possibility of its realization, and therefore interest in the work is restricted to a comparatively small proportion of Christian people; the majority stand aside and remain passive in the matter.

Those who are in sympathy with the cause, but who refuse to take part in working for it, are wont to defend their passivity on the grounds that they can see no means of attaining that goal, desirable though it may be, and they do not feel justified in devoting time and energy to this problem, while the Church is faced with many tasks which are more immediately realizable.

This criticism raises the vital point: do the movements for

reunion adopt the best possible methods for their work? The discussion of this question is especially timely just now when preparations for summer conferences are in progress in all parts of the world.

In the history of the Church there have been only two recognized methods of reunion work, and these two methods, in direct opposition to one another, are the results of two opposing conceptions of the Church.

The first and best known method consists in a theological debate conducted in accordance with certain well-defined rules, requiring that each Church shall select its ablest and most learned theologians to defend with the utmost possible skill its own theological standpoint, and at the same time to attack with equal subtlety the doctrinal principles of the opposing party. The most controversial points are selected for such a debate, which is held in the hope that one party will be obliged to capitulate before the arguments of the other, and will denounce those beliefs which are thus shewn to be erroneous, voluntarily submitting themselves to the truth professed by the winning party. This method is the logical outcome of that church doctrine which is usually called the "Catholic," but which ought to be called the "Authoritarian," for it claims divine authority for every one of its own peculiar creeds and traditions. This doctrine used to be held by the overwhelming majority of Christian people, and it is still widespread among Roman Catholics and the more conservatively-minded Protestants. Its strength lies in its strictly logical view that truth in its very essence is one indivisible whole which cannot therefore be the common property of different Christian denominations disagreeing among themselves; truth is the gift of God which the only true Church of Christ preserves. From the authoritarian standpoint the Church can never be divided; its oneness is of divine origin and cannot be destroyed by man; the so-called divisions among Christians are nothing but the denial of the absolute truth by heretics and schismatics, and though this denial is disastrous for those who acquiesce in it, yet the sublime Unity of the Church is in no way affected by their misconstructions. And so we are led to believe that there is no such task as the reunion of the Churches, but only the problem of bringing back into the fold the heretics who have revolted against the absolute authority of the Church.

This first method of reunion has been tried many times and in many different circumstances, but always with the same most disappointing results. From an objective study of the occasions on which it has been used, one must inevitably conclude that it is impotent and can never restore the Unity of the

Church. The cause of its repeated failure is to be found in its conception of the function of the Church. It states categorically that the Church received directly from its Founder all its creeds, its forms of worship, and its systems of government; man's responsibility and his fallibility are underestimated, and so the true cause of divisions is never properly defined. The authoritarian conception of the Church fails to recognize that man himself bears the guilt for the loss of Christian Unity; it states that the participants in any Church conflict can be divided into two distinct parties: those who are the chosen vessels of the Holy Ghost, the infallible expounders of the truth, and those who are nothing more than servile tools in the hands of the fiend of the human race, and who thus destroy the unity and glory of the Christian Fellowship. By its very definition this theory claims that the Unity of the Church is inviolable, beyond the reach of human power, and that men can neither unite nor split the Church. The method of the theological debate can therefore do little more than provide an opportunity for upholding the righteousness of those who support the truth and confounding the wickedness of their opponents. It must necessarily defeat its own purpose, and cannot claim to have as its goal the reunion of the Church.

Although the large majority of Christians still hold the authoritarian conception of the Church and are therefore opposed to any reunion work which entails a change in their own position, yet there is at present an important section of people who approach the question of Unity from an entirely opposite point of view. This second group holds a conception of the Church which might be called a "relative" one—the direct antithesis of the authoritarian conception and a reaction to it. It lays strong emphasis on the human elements in the life of the Church, and maintains that the different denominations reflect faithfully all the varieties as well as the imperfections of human nature; that each Christian sect is a legitimate expression of the national and psychological characteristics of its members; that each has an equal right to consider itself a legitimate interpretation of Christianity, provided that it satisfies their spiritual needs. The advocates of this relative method therefore claim that the task which confronts Christendom is not the reunion of the Church, but the federation of all the existing denominations. They are persuaded that this goal may be ultimately achieved by the use of conferences at which representatives of every sect may expound the views held by their own school of thought, and attempt to produce formulæ which shall be equally acceptable to all the parties. Here it is no longer submission to the absolute truth which is required, but the creation of a

working compromise. This second method has been the foundation stone of the recent efforts for reunion, and, although it has proved to be an important step forward compared to the authoritarian method, yet it admits of many serious objections. On the positive side it has undoubtedly achieved a spirit of open-mindedness, a desire to understand the point of view of the other party, an earnest conviction that each denomination stands for one or other aspect of the truth which cannot be arrogated to any one Christian tradition; but these positive contributions are seriously undermined by a consequent tendency to question the reality of Revelation, and thus put the Church on a level with any other humanitarian organization. In failing to recognize the unique character of the Church and to lay stress on its divine origins in the revelation of God in Christ, these advocates of universal tolerance lose the sense of the tragedy of Christian divisions. They no longer consider them to be the greatest sin of Christendom against the Heavenly Father, but look upon them as inevitable expressions of the differences in human mentality. As long as there is no profound realization of guilt, there can be no real impulse for Unity. Reunion is therefore treated as a spiritual luxury, which can be dealt with only when all other more important tasks have been successfully accomplished.

If this analysis of the present situation is right, then the reason for the inefficiency of the reunion work of today is apparent: the two generally adopted methods are both defective, for they are based on an inadequate conception of the Church, and are therefore unable to lay bare the true cause of divisions, still less to suggest effective remedies for them.

The solution of the problem of reunion is to be found in a return to the true Catholic conception which acknowledges both the human and the divine elements in the Church. According to this doctrine the Unity of the Church is a divine gift which man cannot annihilate or even impair, but yet man is entrusted with its guardianship. If he fails to keep the commandment of love he loses the power to enjoy Church Unity and all its attendant spiritual and material blessings. This loss is therefore one of the heaviest sins of mankind, for it is an open revolt against God's plan, a wilful refusal to benefit from the gift of divine love. The lack of unity, moreover, deprives Christians of the fulness of charismatic gifts, for they are inclined to use them, not for the edification of the whole body of Christendom, but for the exaltation of their own denomination above others, and in so doing they commit a sin of spiritual prostitution.

In this light we can see that the real cause of divisions is the

sin of pride, the most insidious of all the manifestations of human fallibility, the pride which offends both God and one's neighbour, the pride which leads to the rejection of love and the glorification of hatred. The horror of religious wars and persecutions throws into relief this cankerous root-cause of Christian divisions. It is by no accident that a considerable number of the agnostics in Christian countries owe their lack of faith to the antagonism evinced by the various sects of those " who profess and call themselves Christians."

If pride is the cause of divisions, where then lies the remedy ? Surely not in conferences, even less in theological debates. The only effectual weapon against this obnoxious sin is the Eucharist, the divine medicine given to us by our Redeemer; it alone can raise us from the degradation of sin. The Eucharist is the corporate action of the members of the Church in which their collaboration and communion with the Holy Ghost reaches its zenith; in it are contained all the necessary elements for the efficient and radical healing of schisms. The Eucharist is sometimes called the Sacrament of Unity, and indeed it is the highest and yet the simplest expression of the unity of all those who believe in Jesus Christ. This common meal, which also symbolizes the drama of the Incarnation, calls those who partake of it to be at peace among themselves and in communion with the rest of Christ's Body. The Church Triumphant and the Church Militant here on earth meet together at every Eucharist, and witness to the world the underlying unity of the whole of creation. The Eucharist purifies the human heart and destroys in it the germs of pride and hatred; it clears and elevates the human mind by disclosing to it the mystery of the Incarnation; it strengthens and stirs man's will by calling him to an unceasing battle against the foes of the human race: sin, poverty, disease, and death. This Sacrament is God's weapon given to mankind to be used against the destructive and disintegrating forces of our nature, and the fact that it has hardly been used at all for the healing of schisms accounts for the disappointing results of efforts made up till now.

This Eucharistic method of reunion is comparatively new, and few instances of its systematic application can be quoted, but in this connection the work of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius ought to be mentioned, for it has made this method the foundation of all its activities.

The Fellowship was founded in 1928, and it grew up out of the conferences in which the Eastern Orthodox, the Anglican, and the Free Churches take part annually. The distinctive feature of these conferences is the central place given in them to the Eucharist. Although no intercommunion is practised,

all the members worship together at the Eucharist, which is celebrated daily according to either the Orthodox or the Anglican rite.

This regular participation in the sacramental life of another Christian community produces a spiritual revolution in those who are engaged in it. A vision of the undivided life of the Church is given to them, although they still remain members of separate denominations. This new experience quickens the sense of personal guilt for the sin of divisions, and at the same time it brings hope of ultimate victory to those who strive after the restoration of Unity. By the Eucharistic method that deadly apathy towards the state of the divided Church is eradicated from the Christian mind, and a knowledge that all are members of the same body springs up in its place. It is in direct antithesis to the method of individual conversion, which tries to satisfy the soul, shocked at the sight of Christian divisions, by transplanting it from one sect to another.

By this method we can see clearly that two parties are involved in the split of the Church, one right, the other wrong; the right party is the Holy Trinity, the pattern of Unity in Diversity; the wrong party is Christian mankind, which either stubbornly tries to impose Unity without recognizing the need for Diversity, or else in despair clings to Diversity without attempting to realize Unity.

But not all Christians are able to use the Eucharistic method, for it requires more than the mere presence at the worship of another denomination, or even the readiness to receive communion with its members. It can only be effective if it is based on the Catholic belief in the Real Presence, and on the realization that every Eucharist of the divided Church is deficient.

These two essential conditions might appear to be very serious limitation to this Eucharistic approach, for they exclude from the field of its application all those who profess the authoritarian and relativist conceptions of the Church. Although this is true, yet this fact in no way discredits the method itself, for those who are authoritarians and relativists are in any case unable to take a real part in the work for the restoration of Unity.

The Unity of the Church can only be built upon the basis of Catholic Orthodoxy, which fully accepts the truth of the Incarnation and recognizes man's responsibility for making it a reality in the daily life of the human race.

Fortunately the number of Christians who profess this truly Catholic belief is much larger than is usually supposed, and many of them are even members of denominations who do not

call themselves "Catholic." The Eucharistic approach appeals to all those who have a sincere desire to gain a true understanding of the traditions of the other Confessions, who possess an open mind, eager to learn new aspects of the same Christian truth, and have a repentant heart, ready to confess its own guilt for the sin of disunity.

It is also a call to Christendom to unite in common action, and to make a practical and systematic application of Christian principles to the social and political conditions of today. It creates a new type of missionary, who brings the message of Unity to the members of the divided Christian bodies.

It is not within the scope of this article to discuss how the use of this method may be extended. Its wider application is certainly possible, as the recent experiments in England have proved. At present the Eucharistic approach to reunion is still only recognized by a comparatively small group of people, but since it possesses all the dynamic qualities of truth, we can only hope that it will ultimately be applied to the whole field of reunion work. In it alone lies the possibility of the reunited Church of Christ, and until it becomes widely accepted efforts towards the restoration of Unity will necessarily be of an abortive nature. That is why the forthcoming conferences in Oxford and Edinburgh, in spite of all their importance, are rightly considered by Christians as only preliminary steps towards Unity. The opportunities which they provide for mutual information and personal contacts are most valuable, yet one cannot but feel that in the catastrophic times in which we live even the most profitable discussions are no longer sufficient. The totalitarian state, that grim parody of the Catholic Church, is rapidly spreading all over the world, and the reunited Church of Christ is the only force which can meet this challenge. Let us pray that the restoration of Christian Unity may not be too long delayed, and that the members of the Church may be able to save Christian civilization by becoming once more one body faithfully obeying the call of the Holy Spirit.

N. Zernov.

THE NATURE OF HELL

THERE is no dogma about which Christians have changed so much in so short a time as they have, in the last fifty years, over the doctrine of eternal punishment. A century ago there were not wanting preachers, in Europe and America, who would not only fulminate upon this subject for an hour at a time, but who could even give the dimensions of Hell, as well as the number who lived there and the exact nature of the pains they endured. Whole congregations were, in certain places, reduced to hysteria, and psychologists have recently spoken of many who committed suicide for fear of the very thing in which they supposed they would thus plunge themselves—being unable to bear the suspense of waiting. Many a middle-aged man today can look back, almost with anguish, at the terrors which the fear of Hell fire stirred up in his childhood; and more than one has admitted that the grim and awful spectacle in which it resulted did more than anything else to save him from sin.

The change in this respect today has been so complete that not a few would deny that it has been wholly good. Even the poet Mr. Herbert Edward Palmer, who is no particular friend of the Church, has admitted in *The Mistletoe Child* that a belief in a hell of some kind is vitally important if the soul is not to become emasculated; and the rather comfortable Hereafter that the average Christian more or less assumes he will inherit does little to vindicate the Christian Deity as the Disposer of Eternal Justice. Moreover, there exists a very common confusion between the nature of Hell and its reality; and we should do well to remember, as the late Baron Von Hügel argued so decisively in his *Philosophy of Religion*, that the essence of Hell is its eternity. Whether that state consists of all the torments that the mediæval artists and Puritan preachers devised, or simply in a great remorse, it is Hell if it is eternal and it is not Hell if it is not eternal.

This does not mean that the nature of Hell and the fact of its eternity have nothing whatever to do with each other. On the contrary, we must remain quite in the dark as to its nature once we separate it from eternity; but directly we realize that this state must be considered as eternal, this very fact begins to shed some light on its nature. For all bodies, as we know them, are temporal; and all material existence is temporal. Any form of bodily pain therefore must be of a temporal nature also because, being located in the body, it cannot outlive that in which it is located. Moreover, all

bodily pain is a sign that the part affected is being worn out, and consequently cannot long survive—unless the cause of the pain is removed. All this shews, as does everything else connected with it, that physical pain belongs to the temporal order, and can only affect the spiritual and eternal through the temporal and material.

The monstrous belief in a physical Hell, with all its attendant horrors, has done more damage to the Church in history than has any other of its doctrines. Not only has it provided ample material for minds in a pathological condition to work upon; but could even cause so great a scholar and gallant a saint as Sir Thomas More to talk like a demented little tub-thumper. It is really no cause for wonder. The marvel is that so many good people remained sane and happy while acquiescing in a dogma that would drive most imaginative moderns out of their minds! We may fairly hope that the doctrine of Hell as a place of material torment is one of the few ideas which have really gone for good. It scarcely deserves even a decent burial.

The belief that our Lord ever taught such a notion is based upon a literal acceptance of His imaginative portraiture that we would never dream of accepting in any other context. There is no more reason to believe that He meant material fire in His use of the phrase "Hell fire" than that He meant to imply a material meaning to the phrase "I am the vine and ye are the branches." This is, of course, a dangerous field of controversy; but let any who still doubt remember that He spoke of the place "where the fire is not quenched" as the same as that in which "the worm dieth not"—which, if taken literally, would form a complete paradox. Surely it is more reasonable to suppose that He had in mind the notion of Gehenna—the great rubbish heap of Jerusalem—in which the fire was always smouldering; and the language which He used in this context lends colour to the theory.

Let it not be supposed, however, that the doctrine of Hell depends for its truth upon its material reality. For that is exactly what it does not do. The very arguments by which we dispose of the possibility of a physical Hell postulate a spiritual one; and it is with the nature of that spiritual Hell that this article is concerned. For if it be true that the body is the only possible vehicle for bodily pain, then the soul is the only possible vehicle for spiritual pain. Most of us will not need to be persuaded of this, because we have endured it in this life—sometimes to our healing. Spiritual pain cannot destroy the life of the soul, because the soul is immortal, but it cannot fail to have an effect upon it—for better or worse; and it is the problem of its effect upon the soul that must be

solved if we are to believe in the possibility of an eternal Hell.

Now there is a school of thought, growing today to dimensions undreamt of before, whose realization of the healing quality in spiritual pain has resulted in a belief in Universalism: the ultimate salvation of all. This is, of course, no new dogma, but was largely believed among the disciples of Origen. At one time it threatened to captivate the whole Church; and a certain strain of Universalism has come down into the Eastern Orthodox Churches of today—no doubt largely owing to the influence which the thought of Origen has always exercised upon it—resulting in a miasmal mist that partially obscures all their dogmas about the Hereafter. It is, in fact, impossible to deny the great attraction of this theory; but it cannot be made to survive the hard knocks that the moral reason undoubtedly gives it.

For one thing, there is not a vestige of evidence for such an idea in the New Testament. Our Lord made nearly fifty pronouncements about eternal damnation; and it would be quite impossible to call them all in question without calling into question the whole corpus of His moral teaching. Every attempt to do so has broken down; and even Dr. W. R. Inge, who is no great friend of orthodoxy, has admitted that the certainty of Hell is one of the foundations of our Lord's teaching upon moral conduct. The sheep and the goats—the wheat and the tares—the foolish virgins and the final judgment—are all patterns in the web of His thought without which it would have no fixed meaning so far as good and evil are concerned.

This must be a final argument for all those who profess and call themselves Christians—until every reported utterance of His upon the subject has been proved an interpolation. Even then, however, there would be difficulties that are insuperable for those who take the Christian view of life as it is lived in this world. For to all such this life must always be judged as a period of probation in which the soul fits itself for the life to come. It is tried "as gold in the furnace" is tried—in order that it may qualify for eternal life in Heaven; and those of us who believe in a state of purgatory for the majority after death —a belief that is by no means limited to Roman Catholics—believe that this is a temporal stage in the soul's pilgrimage in which, if it has qualified for Heaven in essentials, it is purged from the stains of sins that still cling to it from earth. It is in no sense regarded as a second chance.

The theory of Universalism, deeply attractive to the heart as it must always remain, is entirely opposed to the idea of life upon this earth as in any sense probationary—makes, in fact,

complete nonsense of the notion. For if it does not *ultimately* matter whether the life we live here is good or evil—whether, in fact, we are good or bad, so far as our eternal destiny is concerned—we cannot be said to be on probation at all; and the whole philosophy of Christian moral conduct is in the melting-pot. The one thing that makes tolerable the thought of the pains and frustrations which we endure here, and which harmonizes them with an Almighty God who is also a loving Father, is the belief that they form the anvil on which our souls are forged for life in Heaven. Once the belief creeps in that we shall have as much chance of making good hereafter as ever we have here, we are forced to ask why there is any "here" at all; and what on earth is the good of all the pains and frustrations through which we have to go.

There is, in fact, no dogma among all the heresies that is more likely to sap the vitality of the moral sense than this one; and if in our hearts we feel attracted by a God who will ultimately save all His creatures alike, our heart must be immediately revolted by the spectacle of physical pain and miseries over which so many have heroically triumphed—when it would have been just as possible for them ultimately to have attained that good without one iota of that suffering. It is appalling to think of the havoc worked upon Christian minds by the teaching of a material Hell, and it has been responsible for some of the worst crimes which the Church has perpetrated; but at least it may be said that the doctrine of Hell, as such, has given to Christianity a stamina by means of which it has weathered all the storms of the world, the flesh and the Devil, up to now.

This does not mean, of course, that Christians should be good for fear of Hell, although the spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola may look rather like that to the uninstructed; but, rather, that a belief in Hell shews to us the meaning of sin in its true proportion. We cannot understand the full horror of sin because we are tainted with it; but we can, by looking at its results, gain an insight into its true nature. The contemplation of eternal damnation is therefore one way in which we can visualize the full horror of going so far into sin that there is no way out again; and the Universalist, with his doctrine of the ultimate restitution of all things, is robbed of this vision of the true nature of sin.

To the Christian, however, the revelation in Christ is the most important thing; and the Gospels bear uncompromising witness to His teaching upon a subject of which most modern theologians are as shy as the mediævalists and the Puritans were cocksure. Universalism, however, is not the only alter-

native to Hell; and another doctrine is becoming more and more widely held even among orthodox Christians; and that is the doctrine of Conditional Immortality. It affirms that, since the world is of a probationary nature, and we are put into it to qualify for eternal life, those who fail so to qualify themselves die, soul and body together, and become extinct.

It is impossible to deny the great attractiveness of this doctrine. Not only does it avoid the apparently unforgiving nature of a Deity who assigns some of the creation to everlasting punishment; but it can be harmonized with New Testament teaching. For it does not, like Universalism, strike at the root of our Lord's teaching in regard to final judgment; and it does vindicate, most exactly, the probationary nature of our pilgrimage on earth. What our Lord says about "the worm that dieth not" and the "fire that is not quenched" can be squared with the doctrine of Conditional Immortality as signifying eternal death for the incurably wicked; and there are passages in the Epistles of St. Paul that seem actually to vindicate such a view. It is one that is likely to enjoy much favour among those modern thinkers whose conception of the difference between the soul and the body has become blurred.

Now this view is less likely to be defeated upon purely theological grounds than it is upon philosophical grounds. The appeal to texts is not quite weighty enough to dispel it—since, as we have seen, Conditional Immortality is a theory that will harmonize with some of our Lord's most important pronouncements upon the life to come. There is, however, a philosophy about these matters, particularly concerning the soul; and the theory of Conditional Immortality assumes certain philosophical inconsistencies which, if true, would throw all our ideas about the nature of spirit and the spiritual world into the melting-pot.

Let us look first at this present world—at the panorama of life as it is lived by Nature—and see whether, in God's plan, we can discover any extinction of the lot of those departments that do not do His will. This will not, of course, finally prove or disprove the doctrine of Conditional Immortality; but it is the only means by which we can obtain some material data upon which to base our search into the spiritual world. It was the method invariably used for analogy by St. Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa*; and, in fact, no other method is possible —since all other evidence must remain invisible.

Surely the first thing that must strike us, in our search, is that extinction is exactly *not* God's way out; and that once He has committed Himself, He does not violate His own law. Nature is positively crammed with material which has not

fulfilled its purpose; and evolution is "red in tooth and claw" with it! All the blind alleys of the evolutionary drama, the huge wastes of Nature and the undeveloped races of mankind, produce a perfect harvest of difficulties for the enquirer into God's purpose; and the fact is often quoted against any theistic conception of the universe. There is, of course, an *organization* at the heart of Nature upon which is based the argument from design; but the untold wastage that goes with it is strong evidence for the belief that the whole thing is by no means contingent to God's purpose.

For God's laws are (as His nature demands that they should be) unalterable; and He has treated all things in harmony with the nature which they naturally pursue. Thus He has ordained that all flesh dies. We cannot say that some flesh dies and some does not. Either all flesh dies or none does so, because it is the nature of flesh to do the one or the other; and the nature of a thing is obviously determined by that which composes it. In the same way all matter disintegrates. We cannot say that some matter does and other does not. Either all must or none can, because it is the nature of matter, by its composition, to do so. Now if the spiritual world is to be regarded as a part of God's creation—the rational God who has revealed Himself to us through the material creation—we may surely suppose that it is governed by rational laws; and cannot, in fact, conceive of it being otherwise. It must, therefore, live according to its nature; and we can therefore say that it is the nature of all souls to live for ever or of *no* souls to live for ever. If we believe that some souls perish while others live eternally, we are faced by some immense difficulties; and not least among them is the fact that God has violated His own law.

This, moreover, is but one aspect of the problem. There are many others to solve. What, for instance, is the composition of a dead soul? We do not even need Aristotle to tell us that all substances must endure—since there is no single experience known to man of one that does not do so in some form. It is all part and parcel of God's inability to violate His own law; and modern psychologists have now proved beyond all doubt that every mental experience lives for ever in the mind in the same way. Are we to believe that this growing body of experience, which never loses one iota in its growth, is suddenly to dissolve? If so, we shall want to know into what it will dissolve, and what is to happen to the personality that alone has raised such events to the status of an experience, and thus given to them any significance at all.

These are but a few of the riddles that must be solved by

the apologists for Conditional Immortality; and once we have disposed of these two important and magnetic theories—Universalism and Conditional Immortality—we are left with the doctrine of Hell in all its grim reality. While refusing to shirk it, however, it is impossible to arrive at a theory of Hell that will harmonize completely with a God who is a loving Father unless we believe such a state to be the best possible destination for those who inhabit it. It must be the only method whereby such souls can realize the completion of their personalities; and that is not the least terrible thing about it.

Now if the doctrine of eternal punishment is to be morally and intellectually tolerable, it is not enough that it should be of a spiritual nature; and that sensibility in us which is revolted by the spectacle of eternal suffering is something quite fundamental to our Christianity. It is intolerable that suffering should be inflicted without a motive so long as it is against the will of the sufferer; but this objection disappears if we believe that those who are doomed to everlasting damnation are doomed by their own liberal consent. This does not mean so much that those who go to Hell go there of their own free choice as that, when they are faced with the eternal verities and realities for the first time, they realize that it is the only possible choice they can make. The whole organization of their lives will surely be seen to make such a doom inevitable.

This is not an attempt to water down a dogma to which we are inevitably led by our logic, but one that is founded upon the facts of existence as we know it here. For we all know individuals who deliberately choose bad company rather than good—not because bad people are so often more charming than good people, but because in their company they can realize themselves more completely—their capacities for cruelty, unscrupulousness and greed. This rapidly grows into a terrible condition of mind which becomes hard against the hatred of others and begins to enjoy hating itself; and if such an individual finds himself among the friendly and generous, the just and courageous, he becomes suspicious and unhappy. He would be a bold man who prophesied that all such were ready for Hell; but he would be even bolder who denied that such a one was on the way to that eternal damnation—if he continued to grow in evil deeds and harden himself against the possibility of choosing good.

It need hardly be said today that many of us have got our moral values upside down; and that there may well be a fair proportion of churchwardens among those who are thus doomed and not a few " black sheep " who will ultimately get to Heaven, as the sin of spiritual pride poisons the mind to

an extent that nothing else does; and it is just here that we have our Lord's own word about the people who must go to Hell. For we have it on His own authority that there is "an eternal sin"; and that those who commit "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" are those who cannot tell right from wrong. For how can there be salvation for such a one? He would be bound to make a wrong choice; and the Pharisees who accused Him of casting out devils by Beelzebub were already in Hell. They had made their choice. It is small wonder that "the publicans and harlots" were capable of a better one. For at least they had never been poisoned by spiritual pride, the deadliest of all sins, and the one that most easily besets the good.

All notion of injustice in the doctrine of Hell must surely disappear if we take this view of it; and those who are in Heaven can be happy in that state if they know that the damned suffer by their own consent. It was not a heretic, but the Curé d'Ars, who, when confronted with a pentitent who told him that he was ceaselessly tormented by the fear of Hell, replied that if he feared it he would never go there. For those who go there know it to be their home. In this sense we may say that the Universalists are right in that there is ultimate fulfilment for all in the only manner possible for them; and believers in Conditional Immortality can at least have it that, in such a theory of Hell, evil is finally vanquished—since those who are evil welcome their punishment.

It is, of course, impossible to speculate upon the nature of Hell in anything but a moral sense since the final disappearance of the notion of an eternal torture chamber; and speculation upon that subject in any other way is bound to be useless so long as we are in the flesh. It is, however, its moral nature that matters to the Christian; and it was about its moral nature that our Lord was concerned when He drew out its imagery in pictorial fashion. To Him it was the fact of Hell that mattered—the possibility that a soul could lose His Father's Kingdom, and spend eternity in a state of deep remorse. So dare we go farther than He did? The Christian revelation has been silent as to the nature of the pains of Hell; but it has not been silent as to its fact. Remove that fact from the constitution of the Christian moral system, and its ethics of final judgment are meaningless. So, if we will not teach more than Christ did, let us at least not be content with less, but accept the doctrine from Him who alone knew the vast measure of sin.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

BEAUTY

When Leo XIII. recalled the Catholic schools to the stricter following of St. Thomas as their philosophical guide, the world laughed at him as reactionary and obscurantist. In more ways than one time has proved the wisdom of his action. To say that the world has recognized it would be to exaggerate, but signs are not wanting that recognition is, at last, on the way. Modern philosophy is bankrupt. Modern philosophers are coming gradually to realize this, and a few among them are beginning to see that its credit cannot be restored, except by drawing big drafts upon the *philosophia perennis*, the Thomistic philosophy of common sense.

According to M. Jacques Maritain, the well-known Catholic apologist, mankind is capable of knowledge and understanding in two ways—reason and revelation. For his philosophy is the supreme achievement of reason; whereas primitive man who has as yet no philosophy is none the less in possession of some elementary truths which have been derived " in part from that wholly spontaneous and instinctive exercise of reason which we call common sense, but above all from primitive tradition." As regards this last he says that it is " a very reasonable conjecture that the first man received from God knowledge together with existence, that by education he might complete the work of procreation."

It has long been accepted that it is an excellent rule in discussion to define one's terms. It is true that there are people who rebel against this dictum, who assert that truth resides in the vague. Truth of this quality, however, cannot be successfully communicated; it may serve the purposes of private meditation, but not of discourse. It remains true that for successful discussion the definition of terms is useful.

The tradition of Scholasticism has, of course, been continuous since the Middle Ages, though submerged, as far as the non-Catholic world at large is concerned, by the scientific expansion dating from the Renaissance and by the idealistic and other philosophic systems propounded since 1600. It is only relatively recently that justice has been done by wider circles to the authentic values of the great metaphysicians of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Where this interest has taken the form of active partisanship we have the development of Neo-Scholasticism.

M. Maritain adopts this scholastic-neo-scholastic viewpoint with regard to the problems of art and beauty. " The Schoolmen," he says, " composed no special treatise with the

title 'Philosophy of Art.'" Their theories and observations in this field, though "far-reaching," were introduced incidentally in discussion of other subjects. Modern "esthetics," dealing with "beauty" and "art" in too great isolation, "runs the risk of spoiling the proper conception of both."

The Doctors of the Middle Ages did not, like so many of our introspecting psychologists, make town dwellers, bookworms and graduates the sole objects of their studies; they were concerned also with the mass of mankind. But even so, they did not neglect the study of their Master. Pondering the art or activity peculiar to the artifex, they pondered the activity which our Lord chose to exercise throughout His hidden life; they pondered also, in a way, the activity even of the Father; for they knew that the virtue of art is to be predicated peculiarly of God, like Goodness and Justice, and that of the Son, plying His poor man's trade, was still the image of the Father and of His action which never ceases.

The ancients called *habitus* those qualities or stable dispositions which perfect their object. Health and beauty are the *habitus* of the body, sanctifying grace the *habitus* of the soul. So art is the *habitus* of the practical intellect. The artist, however, is a man before he is an artist, and hence the conflicts arise between art and prudence, queen of the moral virtues. The artist requires a certain heroism to maintain himself in the right line of conduct so as not to sacrifice his immortal substance to the devouring idol he has in his soul. It is only abstractly considered as artist, pure and simple, that he is amoral. Art is riveted to its object, the thing to be made, as science is to its object, the thing to be known. The prudent man is the man who acts well; the scientist, the intellectual who knows and demonstrates; the artist, the intellectual who makes things. The artist, artisan or artifex* in the normal course of human development and in all really human society represents the common denominator of man. Christ in assuming the ordinary condition of humanity was a village artisan.

Beauty, then, belongs not to the senses, though its appeal may come through them, but to the mind. It is at home in the intelligible order, with the metaphysical and the transcendental. God is beautiful, and all beauty tends of itself to carry the soul beyond creation. By it we escape from self and individuality, because men are only really united by the spirit. The fine arts, like the Sacraments, like man himself, are a horizon where matter comes into contact with spirit. Yet it is folly

* The term "artist" only began to supplant "artisan" and "artifex" in the seventeenth century when art had grown pompous. The early writers, while distinguishing liberal from servile arts, never used it.

to try to find in art a rest for the soul of man. Only the saints know the secret of that immediate union with essential truth which is the eternal sweetness that God gives. " The Parthenon and our Lady of Chartres, the Sistine Chapel and the Mass in B Minor are . . . destined to be burned on the last day. Created things have no savour."

The modern attitude towards art is fundamentally different from the classical and scholastic attitude. M. Maritain quotes M. Emile Clermont to the effect that the kind of spiritual upheaval which the modern seeks from art the Greeks sought in religion or in wine. From the point of view of beauty, it is the mind which takes the first place in art. St. Thomas says that the perfection of the virtue of art consists in the act of judging. Colours or sounds or words are symbols, making known something other than themselves; a secret principle of intelligibility striving forth. The artist aims at making something beautiful by the display of a form with the help of visible symptoms. Art, then, is fundamentally constructive, creating not by copying God's creation, but by continuing it.

Christian art is not a special kind of art, comparable with Cubist painting or Gothic architecture. It is defined by its subject and its spirit, not by method or style. It is the art of humanity redeemed. It is doubly difficult, because it is difficult to be an artist, and very difficult to be a Christian. " If you want to produce Christian work, be a Christian and try to make a work of beauty into which you have put your heart; do not adopt a Christian pose." " A Christian work would have the artist, as man, a saint." The supreme type of Christian art-forms is the Liturgy. In a High Mass, however, the Church is not seeking for beauty, or for a means of touching the heart. Her sole object is worship or union with her Saviour, and from this loving worship an excess of beauty overflows.

" Art remains always essentially in the sphere of Making, and it is by drudgery upon some matter that it aims at rejoicing the spirit." It is " before all intellectual and its activity consists in impressing an idea upon matter." Beauty, being " essentially the object of intelligence," is

what gives joy, not all joy, but joy in knowledge; not the joy peculiar to the act of knowing, but a joy superabounding and overflowing from such an act because of the object known. If a thing exalts and delights the soul by the bare fact of its being given to the intuition of the soul, it is good to apprehend, it is beautiful.

Beauty is the perfection of the proportion of things before the mind. Nor does this proportion " consist in conformity to a certain ideal and unchanging type," for " this very brilliance of form, the essence of beauty, shines on "—not " through,"

as certain Idealists maintain—"matter in an infinite variety of ways." It is, as St. Thomas held,

in a manner relative—not to the dispositions of the subject in the sense in which relativity is understood nowadays, but to the peculiar nature and end of the thing and to the formal conditions in which it is involved.

Things intended for use are judged by the perfection with which their use is served and have beauty in that kind; things intended for contemplation are in a class by themselves. Extending knowledge has brought us to a kind of analytical discrimination in the handling of materials from which, obviously, there is no retreat. For the immense gain in power can only be denied by cavillers who resent the incidental sacrifices and are in love with an imaginary universe whose gifts are unconditional. The element of personality, then, which lent its charm to all the furniture of life in earlier days, is isolated now in works which we contemplate for their own sake; and the artist in the artisan is effaced. Conversely, the fact that intellect has now been widely applied to life in all its branches makes its specific attachment to art unsatisfactory, even a little wrong-headed. There is a preponderance of the abstract and the repetitive in men's activities today; both kinds are inartistic and the second is born of the first. It is the intellect, in short, which has committed us to machinery. Against all this, the practice of the fine arts stands out as engaging a man's undifferentiated nature in its entirety; and the artist is seen as one whose gift it is to enlarge and re-engender the universe of his experience, at once enhancing and testifying to the life of which he is a member, like the thrush when it builds or sings. Of course, an integrity of that kind is doubly difficult to secure, now that each man is a law to himself; but that makes its confusion with the easier processes of the analytical consciousness all the more deplorable.

Art does not aim at the good of man. Its end is the object the artist has chosen to make over which he is despot. It belongs to the domain of making and not of doing. It is, therefore, not subject to the moral virtue of prudence. The artist works for an end which is not his own end. As such he is independent. His artistic integrity will not save his soul for him, but it is none the less an authentic purity. When grace restores a soul to its state of innocence it restores it in reality. But art restores only the image of paradise, and not in life, not in man, but in the work the artist has fashioned. Even in regard to sin art imitates the action of grace. Anyone who does not know the regions of evil knows little. The artist knows the dark folds and twists of human nature. He visits low places, not because they are the most fertile as

amoralists like André Gide say—for in affairs of the spirit it is virginity which is fruitful—but such places have none the less a base fertility. Sin as part of the Christian world is part of the artist's world. But it is there for a false redemption. Art can make its stuff out of it. It can draw beauty from it, but it will be the beauty of dead matter. The artist may be an illusionist like Wagner transfiguring evil, and as this prodigious sensualist create a *Tristan* from his relations with a Wesendonck. Here art is a parody of the *felix culpa*.

Art and life, in this twentieth century, no less than religion and life, have in a very real sense been divorced. There can be no health for them until they come together again. It is certain that Catholic philosophy has an important contribution to make to this desirable consummation—a fact which appears so soon as we begin to consider the subject. The primary reason for this is that the scholastic thinkers, and in particular St. Thomas in dependence on Aristotle, do not begin with a discussion of what we call the fine arts, but of art in general, from the art of the shipwright to the art of the logician. Beauty, then, as well as "making," are considered in general, and thought does not begin by assuming a separation between art and life.

Art is primarily intellectual; its activity consists in impressing an idea upon a matter. Mere manual dexterity is quite secondary, and this is true both of the fine arts and also of the "making" of the village carpenter and the blacksmith. The man we call the artisan is included in the scholastic definition of the artist, and the ancient insistence on the intellectuality of art "endowed the humblest artisan with a certain perfection of the spirit." In a truly human civilization the artisan represents the average man. "If Christ willed to be an artisan in an insignificant village, it was because He wanted to assume the common lot of humanity."

The years of established and unquestioning faith were also years of high artistic achievement, and, since the desire of the heart is always beauty, there is a recurrent impulse to sound these years for their secret, a recurrent endeavour to recover it and graft it again on our rank modern stock. Then, there is a disposition to suppose that theories of art must be sound in a society in which great art is produced, and that if what once was clearly ordained and faultlessly executed is now lost in fumbling and confusion, it is because we have fallen from the truth. But the evolution of spiritual power proceeds by methods which doom all such reversionary tendencies to barrenness. An established order may be a prerequisite for great art; but you will never find the principle on which today's

impulses may be co-ordinated by examining the principles which were sufficient yesterday. The identification by the Schoolmen of the artist and the artisan, their insistence on the fundamental intellectuality of all art, may be cited as two lines of thought once appropriate and illuminating, but misleading and inoperative now.

It is but one example of a characteristic of modern thought and work that the number of people who understand or appreciate the work of the younger modern artists is comparatively small. Modern sculpture may be important, modern poetry may be great, but the ordinary man does not know whether it is so or not.

There is little agreement, even among the artists themselves, as to what art is or does.

One of the least ambitious definitions of a critic might be this, that he is a man who occupies a position in time and in space. The mere fact of occupying a position implies taking a stand, implies criticism. For the moment, the important thing to us is not what he stands for, but that he stands: a man aware of the existence of events in time and space and interested enough in them to attempt an analysis of them. This, it seems, is a *sine qua non* of criticism. And this notion of criticism is my justification for the short view of a waning world in my introductory sentences.

Indeed, I would say that, with the possible exception of T. E. Hulme's *Speculations*, there is no modern book, dealing specifically with the philosophy of art, which has so much to offer in the way of enlightenment. It is one of those rare books which at one and the same time interpret the past and explain the present, without straining in any way the integrity of their argument. M. Maritain is a philosopher, an exponent of Scholasticism, and perhaps the leading lay apologist for Roman Catholicism in France today; he is also the friend and patron of the most vigorous and advanced movements in modern French painting and literature. The latter part of that statement is perhaps too sweeping, for it implies a lack of discrimination. It would be more exact to say that M. Maritain is the friend of that emergent classicism which distinguishes certain aspects of modern art and literature—the Cubism of Severini, for example, many of whose paintings, I believe, are to be seen in M. Maritain's rooms. . . .

"Within the structure of mediæval philosophy art and beauty have their place, being really so much a part of that structure that they cannot be segregated. It is M. Maritain's purpose to explain what this philosophy was. . . .

"I would like to have shewn in more detail how the

Scholastic theories lead us back to modern art; how the mediæval inculcation of *habit*, or intrinsic force and elevation in the individual, is at variance with all academic teaching; and how, therefore, the revolt of Cézanne is justified by this philosophy. But such a book as this is a breviary for the critic, and I shall not hesitate to return to it when the occasion offers."

Beauty is not conformity with a fixed ideal and changeless type as understood by those who confound the true with the beautiful, knowledge with delight. St. Thomas is not one of the pseudo-Platonists who see the invisible essence of things and this necessary type through the material envelope. He recognizes beauty when the intelligence takes satisfaction in the radiant play of form on suitably proportioned matter. He warns us that beauty is relative not to the subject as we moderns understand it, but to the nature and end of the thing itself, and to the formal conditions in which it is grasped. It is a property of being under a certain aspect, not an accidental addition to it. Beauty is one of the divine names, and God, the source of being, gives beauty to all created things after the property of each. *Ex divina pulchritudine esse omnium derivatur.* Beauty belongs, then, to the transcendental and metaphysical order. Through it man may enter the domain of the spirit and freely communicate with man, escaping the individualism in which matter imprisons him.

Felix Hope.

REVIEWS

URKIRCHE UND OSTKIRCHE. Von Friedrich Heiler. München: E. Reinhardt. Pp. 624. Unbound, 11 RM.; bound, 13 RM.

The fact that Dr. Friedrich Heiler is personally better known in this country than most German theologians and historians, and represents a point of view of which the development is followed with interest by students of Reunion problems in *Eine Heilige Kirche*, should bespeak a welcome for what will be, when the three volumes are completed, a very comprehensive historical survey. The preface to this first instalment (dated at Marburg on "the Anniversary of Dionysius the Areopagite" and gracefully dedicated to the University of Glasgow) contains both an impressive account of its purpose and an amusing summary of varying estimates of the writer's own opinions and position formed on the basis of his former books, including *Der Katholizismus*, of which a new edition is soon to appear as the second part of this work. Here Dr. Heiler begins with the words of Ignatius of Antioch to the Church of Smyrna: "Wheresoever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church"; and devotes nineteen pages to the historical use of "Catholic." It is too little, for it is a far cry from Antioch and Smyrna to modern centres of Conferences where history, except where its survival-value can be estimated in terms of prejudice, is commonly disregarded, because found embarrassing. Yet, brief as it is, this introductory section contains some notable things—*e.g.*, if a closer examination of historical and literary usage may still seem a desideratum, the citation of the following propositions has a special interest:

8. Est catholicitas attributum ecclesiæ Jesu Christi, quod nisi adsit, ecclesia non potest vera nuncupari.

9. . . . Protestantes possunt esse membra vera ecclesiæ, quatenus se catholicos esse meminerunt.

10. Coetus protestantium catholicitatis obliti a fide veræ ecclesiæ abducti sunt.

11. Defectionem a catholicitate sequitur defectio a fide in Jesum Christum, verum Deum et Salvatorem, immo defectio a fide in ipsum verum Deum. Quod notis perspecta historia protestantismi ubique demonstratur.

The last may seem too general in expression, but the significance of all the four is enhanced by the fact that they are taken from a work, appropriately named *Stimuli et Clavi*,

published in connexion with the " Reformationsjubiläum " in 1917. Whether the author, Pastor Heinrich Hansen, is to be regarded as a German Dr. James Cooper or not, we do not know; but in any case they deserve to be pondered rather than ungenerously misused. The whole section might indeed serve as evidence that history is not static but dynamic, and the same conclusion might be drawn from several features of the next hundred pages, devoted to the development of the " undivided " Church. Readers of what Dr. Heiler has to say about the Fourth Gospel or the Pastoral Epistles or the Petrine Commission or Apostolic Succession or the relation to the Mystery-religions may wonder at times, according to their own standpoint, if he is not by temperament inclined to allow too much or too little to arguments on one side or the other; but the statement of alternatives is at least a safeguard against excess of dogmatism, and he is equally conscientious in recognizing the existence of gaps and in refusing the temptation to build upon them.

It is, however, to the next 400 pages, making nearly two-thirds of the whole book, that attention will specially be directed. Here the " Catholic Church of the East " is surveyed alike in its main structure and its particular ramifications with a quite astonishing wealth of illustration from ancient and modern sources, primary and secondary, in many languages. There are misprints, but few in view of the size of the book, and slips, especially in initials (Dr. Pusey and Dr. Kidd are given the same, and in neither case rightly), but it would be a wholesome discipline for the authorities of most English libraries designed to supply the needs of students to observe how few even of the more important modern writers they have upon their shelves. But even more valuable than Dr. Heiler's short studies of the origin and development of the several Eastern Churches and their relation to one another is the longer account given of their doctrines, organization and administration, theological outlook and liturgical practice. These are subjects to which English and American scholars have made considerable contributions, and to most of these reference is made, in some cases—*e.g.*, Mr. G. P. Badger, Dr. Brightman, Dr. Gavin and Dr. A. J. Maclean—repeatedly. The book is most admirably planned, and the particular sections relating to the special features of each Church serve as a complement to what has been said under the title " Die Sakramentenlehre und -spendung der orthodoxen Kirche," and its companion studies of the Orthodox Liturgy, Monasticism Past and Present, Mysticism and Popular Devotion—that " Volksfrömmigkeit " about which it is so easy to say too much or too little, and of

which the simple and childlike in heart seem sometimes to understand the spirit, while the folklorist, anthropologist and "sociologist" mostly tabulate the eccentricities. As an example of Dr. Heiler's own mode of dealing with such problems, this section may well be cited, and the forty-five pages on the Nestorian (East Syrian) Church, like the nineteen pages on the Church of Abyssinia, shew a genuine sympathy which is quite consistent with criticism. A pathetic interest attaches to the account of the Ethiopian Church, for it ends, after very frank criticism of its people, with a quotation from a work by a German Protestant missionary, Hans Anstein, published at Stuttgart in 1935, speaking of its high mission as one of the oldest churches in Christendom—"die Aufgabe, Missionsherd für Afrika zu sein." If the "tragic fate" of the Assyrian Christians has become worse rather than better since he wrote, the Church in Abyssinia has suffered an unforeseen catastrophe from the full consequences of which a refuge may perhaps be sought in a still stranger transformation.

The threefold anathema invoked on Orthodoxy Sunday against all Monophysites, all Jacobites, all Armenians, does not release a Western historian from the obligation of discussing their history and, it may be, suggesting the reasons, even though his own standpoint may be somewhat far detached. And Dr. Heiler, like Mgr. Duchesne and Dr. Adrian Fortescue and Dr. Kidd, has found very much that is interesting to say about those whose orthodoxy is regarded as sufficiently defective to make it impossible for them to walk with the Orthodox in procession, but whose heresy is, it would seem, not sufficiently glaring to forbid them to find a place in the same building. That is not, of course, what Dr. Heiler says, but a position which a reader can verify by observation. He will perhaps be even more likely to be interested in the provisional summary of Dr. Heiler's opinions in regard to the Eastern Church as a whole, which occupies the last twenty pages of the text. Since the second volume is to deal with "Die römisch-katholische Kirche," the third volume is to provide opportunity of estimate by comparison in various aspects. But the present summary in relation to the Catholic and Evangelical characteristics of the Eastern Church again finds a complement in a section which, if it is critical, is not without equally frank expressions and anticipations of a different kind. Some may wish that these final pages had contained less of von Harnack and Prince Max of Saxony and others and more of Dr. Heiler himself, but the setting is his, nor is the inference really doubtful. The greatest tribute that can be paid to it is that it may probably leave everyone a little dissatisfied and for all that

so far as it goes, may have made, like the book itself, a really important contribution to that genuine understanding which, when joined with goodwill, does more than we can see to promote Reunion.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

THE CHRISTIAN CHALLENGE SERIES. By John Heritage. The Unicorn Press. 3s. 6d. each.

(1) CHRISTIANITY IN THE SOCIAL STATE. By W. F. Lofthouse.
(2) THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION. By J. K. Mozley.
(3) THEISM, AGNOSTICISM, AND ATHEISM. By Edward I. Watkin.

The publishers are to be congratulated on the get-up of these books. They are neat, handy, and legible. But careless proof-reading is responsible for a number of irritating mistakes. Sabellius on one page becomes Sabelius on the next; religion is quoted as being "*mortality* touched with emotion"; the word "ambunt" does not occur in the dictionary; "duties" is misprinted for "deities"—and there are other similar mistakes. It is a pity, too, that there is not some General Introduction to define the purpose of the Series. The rather fulsome "puffs" on the jackets are a poor substitute. And a directing hand would probably have avoided some of the direct contradictions by which, in some matters, one book cancels out the statements of another.

There is undoubtedly a place for this Series somewhere between the challenge by which Mr. Beverley Nichols intends to shock us in *The Fool Hath Said* and the more ambitious and expensive series of books on the Christian Faith which the Dean of St. Paul's is editing. We shall look forward to the coming volumes.

(1) Dr. Lofthouse gives the Series a splendid start. He sets a standard of style which is all too rare among modern writers, who seem to oscillate between the vulgarity of journalese and the drab precision of a scientific treatise. It is a sheer joy to find him, over and over again, using the unexpected and *right* word instead of the conventional word. His writing is picturesque, eloquent, and moving—a pleasure to read. It is impossible to give a digest of a book which is itself a digest, and deals with an immense subject in 150 pages. But Dr. Lofthouse's insight and sense of proportion never seem to falter. He says well and boldly many things which, if not new, are often forgotten or obscured. How illuminating, for instance, is his judgment of Calvinism in the Social State: "The mediæval

Church, as we have seen, had forbidden usury, and had upheld, in theory at least, the blessedness of poverty. It had not been conspicuously successful in either attempt. But Calvinism boldly set its approval on the pursuit of gain. This was not a surrender to cupidity. Least of all forms of religion has Calvinism been accustomed to surrender to anything. Its attitude here followed from its central convictions. The Christian man is the child of God. God demands the consecration of all His lawful undertakings, and not a flight from any of them. And God will bless everything to which the Christian puts his hand. His trade is not thus a compromise with his religion, still less a surrender to it. It is his calling. It is his duty to improve his talents, to make a success of his business. The enormous expansion of English trade in the eighteenth century was not wholly the result of the cupidity of a nation of shopkeepers. It was undertaken with something of the seriousness of a religious act, and it grew side by side with the thrift, the self-control, the conscientiousness, and, we must add, the hardness of mind that marked the English middle classes."

He draws a valuable distinction between the Church and Christianity: "The Church is an institution. Christianity is an attitude. They must not be confused. But they are not incompatible." With a well-thought-out clarity he asks and answers the questions which the title of his book raises in the minds of all readers: "Christianity has not succeeded in transforming the whole structure of social life; it is doubtful whether such an idea ever entered the minds of men as a practical aim. To that extent it may be said that Christianity has never been tried. But it has been like a city set on a hill; a fortress, a refuge, a reminder, a hope. Will it ever be anything more? Will it continue to be as much?"

(2) Canon Mozley gives us what we expect from him, an exposition "modern" in the best sense of the word of the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation: "Christ, who came into the limited life and history of men from that eternal and divine life in which He was one with the Father and the Holy Spirit, is history's Lord and not its greatest Son." He avoids a controversial tone; but by convincing statement of the Faith he shows the futility of an emasculated Christianity, such as is favoured by many who claim to be modernists. His treatment of the Kenotic problem, perhaps the most prevalent puzzle in theological thought at the present time, is both sympathetic and masterly, though it is surprising that he makes no reference to Canon Hodgson's writings on the subject. There will be no question as to the value and the success in "getting it across" of the Challenge Series if other essays reach the same level.

(3) The publisher's announcement on the jacket of Mr. Watkin's book informs us that he "has given us a book on his philosophy of the universe." This is an adequate description of a book in which a writer who has read widely gives the result of his study and thought. It is almost exclusively an individual philosophy of life, and will appeal chiefly to those who have been led to conclusions similar to those of the author.

ARTHUR W. HOPKINSON.

SPIRITUAL SONGS. From English MSS of fourteenth to sixteenth centuries (now for the first time modernized). Edited by Frances M. M. Cowper, with a Preface by Herbert J. C. Grierson. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

This volume of sacred poems will be for many readers a surprise and a delight. Owing to the difficulty of the language, those of them which have been printed already can only be read and appreciated by the scholar. But the compiler of this volume has modernized them sufficiently as to make them, with the help of footnotes, reasonably easy reading, without losing the flavour of the original. Indeed, in one or two points she might with advantage have gone further. She has retained the original spelling of "moder" for "mother," which gives an effect of quaintness and oddity, as of a child or foreigner, which of course the original was not intended to convey. However, this is a small point. To many, like Chapman's Homer, they will open a new continent of sacred verse. There is a directness and simplicity about these poems that make them unique in English poetry. They are, for the most part, the outpourings from the heart of the mediæval mystic, of whom Richard Rolle is easily the first. The poems have a great deal in common. Professor Grierson in the Preface says that "there are some beautiful things that will never come again, and not individuals only but classes of things," and claims for these poems "a blend of simplicity of feeling and perfection of art" which will not occur again.

Apart from their no small merits as poems, they are interesting to the historian for the light they throw on the theological outlook of the mediæval mystic. The first comment that anyone reading them for the first time might reasonably make is, "How evangelical they are!" using the word evangelical in the sense that the Passion of Christ is the centre round which everything revolves, and the personal devotion with which they are charged is aroused and sustained by the Passion. The hymn "There is a green hill far away" expresses the

thought underlying most of these poems, though less forcibly and less poignantly.

The theme of the Passion pervades the songs of the Incarnation and the Nativity. It is the ground alike of Christ's appeal for man's love and His reproach of man for his ingratitude:

> Pined, nailed and done on tree
> All, man, for love of thee.
> Love thou me, as thou well ought
> And from sin thee withdraw.
> I give thee my body with wounds sair
> And thereto shall I give them mair
> Above all this certain, I wis;
> On earth my grace, in heaven my bliss, Jhesu.
>
> RICHARD ROLLE.

The theme of the Passion cannot be kept out even of a Grace before Meals:

> Loved be thou my King
> and thanked be thou my King.
> And blessed be thou King,
> Jhesu, all my joying,
> of all thy giftes good,
> that for me spoilt thy blood
> and died on the rood.
>
> Thou give me grace to sing
> the song of thy loving;
> my love to thee ay spring
> without any feigning.
>
> RICHARD ROLLE.

Finally, though the poems are all of one pattern, those of Richard Rolle seem to stand out. This gem by him may be quoted in conclusion:

> Jhesu that died on the rood,
> for the love of me,
> and bought me with thy precious blood,
> thou have mercy on me.
> What me *lets* of anything
> for to love thee,
> be it me lief, be it me loth,
> do it away from me.
>
> C. P. S. CLARKE.

NOTICES

Poems. By Frederick George Scott, D.S.O., M.C. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Archdeacon Scott is a veteran priest of the Canadian Church, and was known to all ranks of the Canadian forces in the War as a chaplain of rare courage and spiritual power; and here, in this beautiful collection of his poems, will be found the secret of his influence. For they are the poetry of a great lover—of a man who loves nature, and his fellow-men, and God with simplicity and with all his heart. That is the message of his life, clothed in poetry which it is a delight to read. Not only is the language noble, and the metres varied and supple, and the musical quality sustained; but it has that inner combination of meaning with expression which distinguishes true poetry from verse. Each word or phrase seems the inevitable one for its place, as though it had flowed there of its own accord, and nothing else would do instead.

The poems cover a wide range of subjects: ancient history saga, the works of nature, patriotism, religion, Rome—all these are drawn on, and all of them "touched to fine issues." One of the most striking features is the way in which the poet loves to set his subject against the background of the natural order. In "A Song of Triumph," for example, man is seen as the heir of the vast processes of evolution, and yet as greater than all by dint of his moral stature:

> For the soul that is pure shall endure when the planets have crumbled in space.

In this poem, indeed, one might almost scent something Pelagian, some over-praising of man, were it not balanced by others in the volume (such as the exquisite lines called "Crucifixion"), which shew how firm is the author's hold on the Christian faith. Perhaps the most characteristic single poem is the sonnet entitled "The Heaven of Love," which is too good to quote except in full:

> I rose at midnight and beheld the sky,
> Sown thick with stars, like grains of golden sand
> Which God had scattered loosely from His hand
> Upon the floorways of His home on high;
> And straight I pictured to my spirit's eye
> The giant worlds, their course by wisdom planned,
> The weary waste, the gulfs no sight had spanned,
> And endless time for ever passing by.
>
> Then, filled with wonder and a secret dread,
> I crept to where my child lay fast asleep,
> With chubby arm beneath his golden head.
> What cared I then for all the stars above?
> One little face shut out the boundless deep,
> One little heart revealed the heaven of love.

There is a world of theology here, a complete answer to those who tell us that the vast spaces and ages disclosed by modern astronomy have upset our faith. For life and love are worth more than space and time—more significant, more relevant, better witnesses to the truth of things. This is Archdeacon's Scott's message to our time, and we hope that it will be widely read.

E. G. Selwyn.

GOD AND MAN. Four Essays on the Nature of Personality. By Emil Brunner. S.C.M. 5s.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST AND THE PROBLEMS OF TODAY. By Karl Heim. Nisbet. 6s.

In this country the names of Barth and Brunner are frequently to be heard mentioned in the same breath, as if the two famous leaders of the "Dialectical School" were in complete accord as regards both message and method; but this is most certainly not the case. Karl Barth strikes the genuinely prophetic note in everything he writes. He thunders forth his message of God's transcendence and man's creatureliness in as vehement and as paradoxical terms as possible. His theology is not presented in an easy, orderly, or constructive form. Brunner, in contrast, fully earns the title of a "Systematic Theologian." His writings largely lack Barth's prophetic fervour, but they bear constant witness to a very tidy thinker and a calm reasoner. What Barth once termed his "uncanny clarity" makes him very much the easier of the two to read and understand.

The theological partnership between Barth and Brunner, as is probably generally known, came to a dramatic close over two years ago. The two theologians parted company most decisively on the vital issues of the legitimacy of a "general revelation" and of the significance of the creation of man in God's image, Barth declaring against Brunner that "Scripture is the sole source of our knowledge of God," and denying that any "point of contact" remains between fallen man and God. Mr. David Cairns has prefixed his most capable translation of *God and Man* with an extremely valuable introduction, nearly all of which he devotes to a full consideration of the theological points which have led to this rift between Barth and Brunner.

God and Man has the sub-title of *Four Essays on the Nature of Personality*. In Chapters I., II., and IV. Brunner considers the relation of faith to the three main types of philosophical systems, to the two main species of rationalist ethics, and to the three main types of rationalist psychology, respectively. He shews how in each case the Christian Faith provides the only satisfactory basis for an understanding of personality. The Christian Revelation "affords true knowledge and salvation as contrasted with philosophy." Justification by faith and not natural ethics gives us true freedom, and allows us to forget ourselves and enter into a true personal relationship with others. What he terms "Biblical Psychology" alone allows a man to gain a true insight into the nature of his self and the conflicts which go on within himself. Chapter IV., headed "Church and Revelation," may not at first sight appear to fall in with Brunner's scheme, but as we read on we discover, to quote Cairns' introduction, that "the connection between the Church and personal being is this, that only the man who has let himself be spoken to in love by God is in the full sense of the word a person." And to hear the loving message of God that man must be within the Church.

Much profound and original thinking is to be found in this book, but it is to be regretted that it has had to be compressed into so small a space. To anyone largely unversed in the technicalities of philosophy and, more so, of psychology, the book is not easy reading. We could have wished that the book were quite twice the length, and that the

many valuable points could consequently have been brought out with a greater wealth of illustration and of explication.

The Church of Christ and the Problems of To-day, in contrast, is admirably simple and abounds in those homely and forceful illustrations at the making of which Karl Heim is such an adept. The marked simplicity of the book may come as a surprise to the English reader who only knows of Heim's theology through a perusal of *God the Transcendent*, but Heim is versatile enough to be able on one occasion to embark upon the most abstruse points of philosophy and the next occasion to be writing in the clearest and most practical way of the problems of the moment. Anyone who has heard Heim both lecture on Dogmatics and also preach to a congregation will know this to be true. The book is, indeed, throughout most refreshingly relevant. The old problems such as faith and justification, sin and forgiveness, prayer and the future life are dealt with, but they are presented and considered and resolved in a form in which the man of today will readily comprehend them. In so doing Heim proves himself a faithful representative of the present "Tübingen School" of theologians who are so strongly insisting upon the Faith being presented and understood in relevance to the actual facts and conditions of contemporary life, and not in any artificial system.

Perhaps most typical and most valuable of all is Heim's consideration of the present concept of "leadership." Persons rather than ideas or systems are gaining men's allegiance in the world of today. This signifies, Heim suggests, that "despite the secularism of the present, men are much nearer to an understanding of primitive Christianity than they were fifty or a hundred years ago." They are learning to understand the absolute claims made by a Person, and thence can readily grow a deep understanding of Christ's claims to absolute lordship over the whole of life.

The all too rare claim can be made of this book that it may with confidence be recommended equally to the trained theologian and to the ordinary "man in the pew."

R. J. C. Gutteridge.

Happy Families. By Marie Louise de Meeûs and Margaret Blundell. Sheldon Press. 3s. 6d.

This little book is about the system of smallholdings among the Belgian peasantry which from tiny beginnings has grown to be the national system. It is written with a vivacity which almost amounts to fervour, for the authors, one of whom is native to the country and the other now long resident there, are not only convinced that the system which they describe has been the salvation of the Belgian *paysan*, but might also prove of equal value to the English villager. This thesis is set forth in such practical terms that, if only for this reason, the book deserves serious consideration, especially by those who are directly concerned with the problems of the countryside.

The story of the Boerenbond, as these ladies set it out, reads like a romance. It came into being officially at Louvain in 1890, but four years earlier the Abbé Mellaerts, curé of the rural district of Goor in Flanders, had started the movement with a little group of seven peasants, and he remained its guiding spirit until it was firmly established as a national

system. It owes much for its ideals to the German philanthropist Raffeisen (born 1818), from whom it took its motto, "Each for all and all for each"; and secure in this principle, its activities and its resources have grown till it is now nation-wide and the strongest social influence in the rural life of the country.

Its aim is set forth in the opening paragraph of its statutes:

> "The chief object of the Belgian Peasant League is to labour for the religious, intellectual and social advancement of its members." It works through parish guilds, and its essential character is shewn by the requirement that any cultivator in the district can enjoy the benefits of financial assistance (*e.g.*, through the League's credit banks) "provided he leads an honest moral life and practises his religion."

The moral and outstanding features from the English point of view of this great agricultural co-operative movement are these: (1) The whole family is concerned. It does not depend on the father as the sole bread-winner, but each member of the family—father, mother, boys and girls—has an allotted share in the family scheme of life, the male part doing the harder work on the land, the female part tending the cattle, poultry, etc., and making the bread, butter, cheese, etc., for the household within doors. (2) The produce of the smallholding is used first for the maintenance of the family and only secondarily for sale at market. There are other features to be noted, but these two stand out as primary.

Can such a system as this be reproduced in England? The authors are convinced that it can. They are largely concerned with the problem of bringing town workers out to settle in the country, and they believe that when once the townsman sees the advantages he will gladly respond. But any scheme of that kind has its own problems, not insuperable, perhaps, but obstinate. The Potton (Beds) settlement, which is mentioned with high approval, has its difficulties. Town life and town work does not produce the kind of physique fitted for agricultural work, nor does the mind accustomed to the "amenities" of urban life easily accommodate itself to rural conditions. Officialdom, too, though perhaps necessary in the conditions of the settlement, is apt to curb ardour. The Boerenbond has a very strong element of officialdom, but it belongs to the Boerenbond, it is not imposed from without—not even by a paternal government.

The second important feature—that of "subsistence holdings"—still survived in England less than fifty years ago, but has now practically disappeared. Rural England has become so far commercialized that to regard a holding as a direct means of subsistence for the family rather than as a means for making money at the market would be practically a new idea. Something, however, is being done through the Small Holdings Act of 1919, supplemented since 1934 by the work of the Land Settlement Association, which works in co-operation with the county councils and is assisted by Government grants to meet private subscriptions.

But it must be emphasized that this is a totally different method from that of the Boerenbond, which began and continues still, through all its multiple ramifications, as a mutual self-help society.

The question for those interested in or responsible in any measure for life in rural England is not so much the transplanting of town-dwellers

into the country, laudable as that may be, but the retaining of those already there, born and bred in it, native to its soil. Obviously they will need some incentive strong enough to counteract the attractions of town life. Country life and work must have some definite worth-while objective for the country boy or girl. That is where the present scheme of elementary education in rural districts seems to some of us to fail. It is planned much more on urban than on rural lines. A notable experiment is being made in Cambridgeshire by the establishment of Village Colleges in which plus-eleven children from the surrounding district are taught the ordinary school subjects in the morning and practical "country" subjects in the afternoon, and in the evening there are classes in these subjects for older people. It is a promising experiment which should help towards the solution of one part of the country problem.

But the question of land tenure for smallholders, the question of real co-operation and mutual help, and, above all, the question of replacing the commercial idea of growing for the market by the idea of growing for family subsistence—all these await solution.

They were solved in Belgium by the genius of the parish curé of Goor, working first within the limits of his own charge. Does that point the way to possibilities in England? *Happy Families* shews how it was done there and suggests how it might be done here.

J. R. Pridie.

Man and his Maker. By Percy Dearmer, D.D. S.C.M. 3s. 6d.

This is Dr. Dearmer's last work on which he was engaged at the time of his death. It represents the result of profound study on some of the greatest problems of the day. He reviews the evidence as to the character of God as supplied by the evolutionary process. Part I. deals with the problems of Pain, Misery, and Evil; the writer finds a way out in the fact that as human knowledge increases, these difficulties will increasingly diminish. The Christian view of God brings a new light on suffering and evil. The world exists in order that free spirits may arise; its end is the making of souls. To attain this end human thought must turn to the consideration of the ultimate Reality.

F. N. Heazell.

Mastering Life. By Peter Fletcher. Rich and Cowan. 3s. 6d.

This is a useful treatise by a psychologist with a considerable knowledge of human nature. He writes to help the ordinary reader to give a true expression to his personality. The style is simple, and the tone religious and devout. The relationship of the individual with his environment is set out in two introductory chapters; this should lead the individual to a right understanding of his own nature. The true meaning of life is shewn to come from the co-operation of human with the divine nature in a spiritual relationship from which alone the mastery of life can be established. The book closes with an envisagement of good in an uplifting chapter, where it is stated "there is no character good enough or great enough to be a pattern upon which human nature can mould itself, except the character of Jesus Christ."

F. N. Heazell.

Scottish Church Architecture. By J. S. Coltart. Sheldon Press. 12s. 6d.

This is a beautiful book, so beautiful in the print of its two hundred and sixty-four pages as well as in the reproduction of more than eighty drawings and photographs, that the reader is tempted to give first place to the illustrations and only second to the stores of information, architectural and historical, contained in the volume. But the writing is nearly as good as the pictures and the combination makes the book one of the most attractive publications of the year.

Such a volume has been long over-due, for so far as I know nothing of the kind has been written since Macgibbon and Ross produced their monumental work in three volumes on the ecclesiastical architecture of Scotland forty years ago, though the Commissioners on the ancient and historical monuments of Scotland have already done much to extend our knowledge of the architectural treasures of the past. These are not nearly as rich or as well preserved as are the ancient churches of England. An old parish church is nearly as rare in Scotland as a pretty village. Yet Mr. Coltart's volume proves that there are some fine churches scattered over Scotland preserving, most of them, ancient features and still in use for worship, notably Glasgow Cathedral, Linlithgow, Aberdeen, Dunblane, Roslin, St. Giles, Edinburgh, and even village churches like Symington, Ayrshire. Of all these Mr. Coltart has much to say, as well as of the small number which were built in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries before the "barn" period of church building began.

The volume consists of seven chapters, of which the sixth, extending to 150 pages, is likely to be the most useful to the ordinary reader. Here we have a full list of all the Scottish churches that are worth inspecting, each one carefully and succinctly described. The author has wisely arranged this part of his book geographically, so that the descriptions are conveniently grouped by their districts. Of even greater interest are the two chapters dealing with the details of Scottish Gothic, pillars, doorways, towers, etc., and furnishings such as screens, Sacrament houses, sedilia, and the like. Sacrament houses are to be found in the east and the north-east of Scotland, the two best specimens being one in the roofless church of Deskford near Cullen and the other at Fowles Easter, the former in the usual north wall, the latter in the east wall of the chancel. Very little old woodwork has survived in Scotland, but at King's College Chapel, Aberdeen, some fine carved woodwork is to be found in which the Scotch thistle is a prominent feature.

Mr. Coltart gives an excellent account of Celtic art, of the French and English Gothic influence, and brings out clearly the characteristics of Scottish church architecture. He has rendered a signal service to Scotland in producing this book, and the Sheldon Press has excelled itself in the perfection of its illustrations, type, and binding.

W. Perry
(*Dean of Edinburgh*).

Can We Believe in God? By C. A. Alington, D.D. Rich and Cowan. 3s. 6d.

Dr. Alington has struck out a line of his own in the production of popular apologetics. A previous example of his fairness and skill, *The Fool Hath Said*, shewed that he could put much thought into short

compass, and his latest book will add to his reputation in this field. It is temperately written, without, however, making unwise concessions. On the contrary, the Dean says: "I cannot conceive why so many people are content to take up a purely defensive position as if they were holding an ancient and venerable fortress and defending a position which is rapidly becoming untenable." On the contrary, he maintains that we ought to say to the world: "We offer you an explanation which gives a meaning to your life. It is not an easy explanation, but there is no sort of reason for expecting an easy answer to so vast a problem." To shew that this is a coherent explanation is the author's aim, and he follows it up by indicating the practical demands it makes upon believers. He is hopeful even of the international situation, and believes that all real progress is due to religion. Very welcome is the emphasis on Christian missions (though the phrase "Protestant missions" jars a little if intended to mean non-Roman), and it is scarcely true to quote the hermit and the monk as evidences of a Christianity which despaired of reforming the world. These, however, are trifling matters; as a whole the book is valuable for its clearness and fairness and for the force with which the truth is presented. Clergy are often at a loss to find the sort of book to offer to an educated layman whose grip on religion is slipping. This is just such a book.

M. Donovan.

Living Religions and Modern Thought. By Alban G. Widgery. Williams and Norgate. 12s. 6d.

Professor Widgery has a long inside knowledge of Eastern religions. His position in the Maharajah's College at Baroda led to an intensive study of Indian faiths resulting in the Lectures which, delivered in 1915, were published in 1923 as *The Comparative Study of Religions*. He was then Stanton lecturer at Cambridge, and is now Professor of Philosophy at Duke University, U.S.A. Probably no one mind has such a comprehensive grasp on the manner and extent to which the religions of the world have been striving to adapt their ancient beliefs, rites, and social customs to the environment of Western education and scientific enlightenment in which they are placed today. In his wide survey, based principally on personal contact with the adherents of the different faiths, it is possible that he gives a too favourable view of the different religions. Even the sexual elements of Hinduism, for instance, "nourish the attitudes of mystic relation to the Deity, the reverence and joy, which are thereby nourished." The writer claims to find beneath corruptions and developments the mystic monotheism which the greater souls of all faiths have presented.

The religions dealt with in the endeavour to discover their inmost spirit, and to describe the modernizing of their educated adherents, are Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Confucianism and Shinto, Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Islām and Bahāism and Christianity; there is a concluding chapter on Religion and Modern Thought. All this is compassed in 300 pages. Throughout there is the effort "to strive with all the resources of scientific criticism for a view of religion which will give a place for all the varied valuable contents of the different religions. Such criticism the writer maintains is analogous to, and just as necessary

with regard to religions as the Baconian investigation of nature. And such criticism, he holds, exposes the futility of Humanism. For "Humanism does not go far enough"—the human being is essentially and consciously related to Another.

With regard to Christianity, we must be content for the scientific investigator to class it in one list with the other religions, comparing its ideas and what he conceives to have been its origin with other origins of other faiths. It need not limit our appreciation of the general value of Professor Widgery's book that he holds a "reduced Christology"; for even he, it may be supposed, if he were the Chairman of that Committee envisaged in Dr. Streeter's recent book, whose object would be to collect the best out of all religions, would find something very like Christianity under construction. If that be so—what think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He?

W. J. Ferrar.

The Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected. By I. B. Horner. Williams and Norgate. 12s. 6d.

The author in this book gives a minute and expert account, well documented, of the development of the famous Buddhist term "Arahan," and of its significance in early Buddhist teaching.

The term did not originate with Buddhism, but was taken up and filled with a higher significance by Gautama, because the original significance of "worthiness" had already taken on a moral, or perhaps even a semi-religious, colour.

The Buddhist concept differed from that which is connected with the term in non-Buddhist writings. Gautama's conception of the Perfected Man is studied in the Vinaya, the Sutta-Pitaka, and in the Abhidhamma Scriptures.

The author shows that there was no "numinous" or mystic meaning attached to the early use of this term.

"Under Buddhism the great Upanisadic doctrine of the immanent divinity of man expressed in the classical phrase 'that art thou' was no longer accepted. It was replaced by a corresponding doctrine of man *becoming* Brahma-like as opposed to his *being* Brahma-like." This was the Arahan theory; it claimed to see man accomplishing perfection—not simulating it. The word "becomes" takes the place of "is."

The evidence both for the rise and growth of the term and for Gautama's conception of the Arahan is drawn from a careful exposition of the Pali Scriptures.

The reason for the failure of the Arahan theory is traced in the post-canonical and Mahayanist works.

The aspect of the Arahan as a social being tended to be eclipsed by that of his solitary retirement for the purpose of perfecting himself. It was supplanted by the idea of the Bodhisattva who, though having attained to Enlightenment himself, returned to succour those erring men and women in this world of illusion.

The last three chapters are a detailed study of certain special aspects of the Arahan character. The general result is to shew that the idea of "becoming," of developing or growing tended more and more to give place to the idea of what man can achieve for himself here and now in this last of his opportunities. So the Bodhisattva idea arose to reassert

the great ideal that the consummation is far beyond any that man can as yet imagine. The Arahan, in its highest and proper sense, signifies, not the achievement of man according to his present limited knowledge, but the steadfastness and courage of him who will " pursue a goal which lies beyond many lives, beyond many worlds."

R. D. M. Shaw.

Thus Religion Grows. The Story of Judaism. By Morris Goldstein. Longmans. 15s.

This is a timely, readable, and useful volume which will be welcomed by all friends of Jewry and should make for a clearer understanding among Christians of the Jewish position. The book is not written for students, though it will be found valuable by them, and almost entirely avoids technical terms which cannot be easily explained. A single exception is the explanation in brackets on page 16—Yahweh being the Hiphil of the verb " Hayyah," " to be "—which conveys nothing to the lay mind. The writer seems a little unsympathetic to the work of Old Testament criticism, which he accepts rather grudgingly. We wish more space could have been given to great independent thinkers, the founders of modern Judaism, like Maimonides or Spinoza, but the amount of ground to be covered and the necessity for compression would make any detailed treatment impossible. Lack of space, too, prevented all but a brief notice of that delightful feature of Mediæval Judaism—the leaving of an Ethical Will, whereby the father handed on to his children his expression of life's greatest riches—the striving after godliness and virtue.

A rather lame apology for the death of our Lord is given in the sentence on p. 126: " The priests themselves were but the tools of Rome." Yet to the present writer it recalls the remark of a Jewish lady made in his presence many years ago: " You Christians say we crucified Jesus: many of you crucify Him every day of your lives." The terrible and shameful persecutions the Jews have often received at the hands of so-called Christians is recorded briefly without bitterness: " What desecration of the fair name of religion," exclaims Rabbi Goldstein, " when both in their own way seek the path to God."

The volume well describes the movements of Orthodoxy, Neo-Orthodoxy, Conservatism, and Reform, and looks at these movements as a sign of life. The " acids of modernity " may change the face of Rabbinic Judaism, but it will enter into a richer, fuller life. Hope seems to be based on loyalty to Israel: " As long as the people of Israel remains there will be a religion of Israel." Here the cleavage between us is most plainly seen. Not to a people, nor even to a Church, do Christians pin their faith, but to a Person—God Incarnate in Jesus Christ. But of Jews and Christians we may say with the good Rabbi: Will God " hide Himself from men and women who deliberately direct their thoughts and deeds to the search for the better life ?"

We notice on p. 193 (a slip, of course), " disassociating "—a word not found in the English dictionary.

R. D. Middleton.

CHRIST AND THE CHURCH. Sermons by the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.

Not many books of sermons published today are worth buying. This little volume is an exception. Dr. Simpson opens with a timely recall to the necessity of definite teaching from the pulpit. "We must," he says, "deliberately face the question whether, in the laudable anxiety to help their people to be devout, priests are not expecting ceremonial to do the work of dogmatic instruction." His sermons on the Eucharist and the Resurrection are especially telling, but every chapter is to be read carefully. It is to be hoped that many young priests will ponder over the last two chapters. "Youth is capable of a very generous response to any great appeal that wins it."

R. D. MIDDLETON.

EVANGELISCHE ETHIK DES POLITISCHEN. By G. Wünsch. Mohr (P. Siebeck). 19s.

There are two indexes to this fine book. One is an index of names, and that is satisfactory. The other is an index of subjects, and for a volume of 656 pages we cannot consider a subject index of four pages satisfactory. There is, we think, little doubt of a second edition being called for, and then we beg the author to provide us with a subject index worthy of his book. True, there is an admirable table of contents, and this in some measure atones for the inadequacy of the subject index, but the atonement is not sufficient.

A preface that opens with a quotation from Richard Rothe almost disarms any criticism we care to offer, and beyond question there must be a Christian approach to politics, and here Herr Wünsch stands on strong ground. The ground is so strong, and he occupies it so ably, that we scarcely dare break a lance with him. And yet we wonder, and cannot help wondering. It seems to us that the processes of industry mean—and must mean in a country so highly organized as Germany—leadership amounting to genius. At any rate the leadership must possess rare and eminent qualities. Are the qualities of this type, owned by Herr Ballin in the past or by Sir John Ellerman, necessarily Christian? Granted that such employers are actuated by lofty aims, granted that they deeply care for the weal of the men working for them, yet the processes of competition are ruthless sometimes to the last degree. Are we to assume, can we assume, that choice by Christian virtue will lead to men in control of business equally efficient? And if we cannot make such assumptions, what becomes of the evangelical approach to politics? Herr Wünsch is a Professor of Theology at Marburg, where doubtless his men receive careful instruction in theology. Can we take for granted that he is equally able to instruct them in the ways and works of big business as it is usually conducted? If he disapproves of these ways and works, is he sure that his ways and works will lead to results at least as efficient as those conducted under a capitalistic system? Of course such a criticism is levelled at all attempts to Christianize business, and we are fully conscious of the criticism that can be brought to bear upon our position, and indeed page after page of this fine book testifies to the fact that the author could train his guns pretty effectively

upon us. Still, we simply point out generally that his position is at least assailable, and that we remain in doubt on the validity of fundamentals he assumes. From this angle the first part of his book deserves —and will receive—careful attention from the many who agree with him in his outlook on business. We wish, with all our heart, we could so agree.

To us the second part of the book is the most valuable. For in it the author discerns the beginning of the capitalistic age in the sixteenth century, and while he has a brief discussion on the Middle Ages he comes to grips with his task in his admirable account of the changes effected by Martin Luther. Inevitably he raises such matters as authority in life and the rise of the modern State which he rightly perceives in what Luther undertook. Whatever he says of Luther is naturally truer even of Calvin. The belief in predestination formed the school of vigorous ecclesiastical and political life. God is active and energetic, and therefore His servant, man, must also be active and energetic. Order and obedience, gravity and chastity, temperance in life and sobriety in thought are qualities every whit as valuable for the State as for the Church. Economy and industry lead on to property, and this in turn leads on to prosperity in the State as much as in the Church. The steps are clear, and they are traced with pith and power by Herr Wünsch. There is, then, a consideration of such side-issues as Münzer and Hofmann and the Anabaptists, and from them the transition to Cromwell and the Independents, Fox and the Quakers, and the Levellers is easy. Here may we say how firm is the grasp of the author on these movements and how much we learn from him on their true inwardness ? Historically, he possesses the rare gift of co-ordinating seemingly disconnected movements and bringing a unity out of them. He returns to his main subject in estimating the labours of Frederick the Great, which he does from his own angle. The step to Bismarck is not difficult to take, and it is even less difficult to take the step of Stöcker and Naumann.

With such a background of history it is easy for the author to perceive that today the national boundaries are slowly yet steadily passing away, and that efforts towards economic and political reform depend as never before upon outside authorities. A dozen international bankers may bring to ruin the finest efforts of any one State. In the last resort we are asked to contemplate faith, the world outlook, and politics, and we commend this final angle of approach. We are sure, increasingly sure, that this is a book to be reckoned with, and because we think this we have ventured to offer some criticism, and no one can lay it down without feeling the liveliest gratitude not only for the learning but also for the historical insight possessed by Herr Wünsch.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher